
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
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: 7/29/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Aunchman, Terry	Assistant Principal	Electives Social Studies Career and Technical Education FTE Social Media Athletics COVID Response Community Partnerships School Records EOY Awards paperwork Safety/Drills/Crisis plan ESD/ESY Master Schedule Facilities Worksite Safety Registration/course cards Promotion Recovery SSAP Articulation
Lipinski, Paul	Principal	English Language Arts Discipline Appeals Allocations Leadership/staff meetings Award Ceremonies School Advisory Council Budget School Culture/Climate Civil Rights School Website/social media EOY Awards Set-up Student Leadership Final appeals for discipline School Improvement Plan Food Nutrition Services Self-Contained ESE Front office/Secretarial Wellness Fundraising Staff Handbook Student Services
Figliomeni, Anthony	Instructional Coach	Math Trainer Coach Department Head
Casel, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Head
Brown, Dawn	Other	Department Head

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kelly, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts
Cicione, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Supporting PLCs and individual teachers in ELA.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/29/2022, Paul Lipinski

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

793

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

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	272	240	284	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	52	45	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	25	0	0	0	0	54
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	90	0	0	0	0	276
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	76	51	0	0	0	0	164
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	90	0	0	0	0	276

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	27	44	41	0	0	0	0	112

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	46%	50%				48%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						54%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						44%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	34%	36%				61%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	61%						62%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						52%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	54%	53%				43%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	59%	58%				59%	68%	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	2022					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	55%	59%	-4%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	45%	42%	3%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2022					
	2019	67%	68%	-1%	46%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	70%	-10%	71%	-11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	34	32	30	49	55	14	46			
ELL	23	27	40	46	72						
BLK	25	50	55	37	77	79	40	50			
HSP	31	28	29	49	62	61	41	67	61		
MUL	20	31		50	71		40	67			
WHT	37	39	34	53	59	65	45	69	53		
FRL	28	34	34	47	60	61	36	60	48		
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			

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	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	48
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	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

More students (34%) did not show proficiency in ELA-Reading and Writing compared to math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading and writing skills show the need for most improvement compared to math. Over one third of students in each grade were at the level 1 proficiency score.

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

ELA proficiency has declined 14% compared to the previous two years.

New curriculum was used last year in reading courses, this could cause a lag in traction for students and staff and may show increases as time goes on.

34% of the students fell into the level 1 proficiency range.

New actions would include continued professional development for reading teachers, interventions in the classroom and in targeted groups. Additional professional development and coaching support to ensure alignment between learning targets (standards), valid and reliable assessments, and most importantly, learning how to translate student performance data in to effective and targeted instructional responses.

1. Focus on supporting teachers with differentiation strategies and collaborative structures for instruction, 2. Dive deeper into main subgroup performance data for discrepancies in year two, 3. Build on progress in Core Actions 1 and 2, with more intensive support to teachers to enable them with the tools, strategies, and confidence to release students "to do the majority of the work." (Core Action 3)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math, 80% of students fell in the level 2 through 5 proficiency range.

97% of students taking Algebra 1 passed the End of Course exam.

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

Strong PLC and coaching supports were a factor. Standards based focus and targeted intervention in the classroom and out of the classroom.

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

-We will need to provide our teachers additional training in differentiation strategies, tools, and mindsets, including menus and options aligned to content specific instruction. This will also include district resources, and supports as well.

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.

1. Focus on supporting teachers with differentiation strategies and collaborative structures for instruction,
2. Dive deeper into main subgroup performance data for discrepancies in year two,
3. Build on progress in Core Actions 1 and 2, with more intensive support to teachers to enable them with the tools, strategies, and confidence to release students "to do the majority of the work." (Core Action 3)

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

We will continue to build on our progress toward a more balanced and coherent assessment system, that allows us to more deeply implement "just in time" recovery opportunities, which is the continuing focus of our work next year.

-We will need to provide our teachers additional training in differentiation strategies, tools, and mindsets, including menus and options aligned to content specific instruction. This will also include district resources, and supports as well.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This area of focus shows the lowest percentages of student proficiency. The skills and strategies in this subject area support student learning in all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

50% of the students will make progress from the first progress monitoring assessment to the last assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

CLMS will implement differentiated tiered instructional actions in response to ongoing standards based assessment. The assessment data will show the progress over time for students as well as implementation progress by the faculty.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use of PLC and MTSS implementation at a deep and rich level will help us reach our desired outcomes. All PLC teams will utilize a unit of study plan with common formative assessments twice per quarter.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Schools with high functioning PLCs show high success rates with student achievement and growth. PLC Institute resources and protocols will help our teachers determine essential standards, assessments, plan tiered interventions and respond to student data to increase learning supports and overall student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Training the faculty on a deeper use of the PLC guiding questions, use of common formative assessments and then providing differentiated tiered interventions for students based on data trends.

Continued support from district coaches to identify, understand and implement district core resources. Professional Development and assistance with resources and possible training support related to differentiated instruction and cooperative/collaborative structures. Verbal De-escalation "Launch Training" as well as monitoring too.

Continue implementation of Anchor PLC Structure to support development and analysis of common formative assessments to improve procedural fluency (consistency), frequency, and accuracy (alignment) of CFA's with standards based outcomes -Implement a revised data analysis protocol based on what we have learned this year, to improve clarity and efficiency toward accurate and timely identification of students within a tiered framework.

Person Responsible

Paul Lipinski (plipinsk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

*Meaningful Adult Relationships: -Our CNA, based on student response data (Gallup), as well as behavioral data reflects that continued focus in this area is warranted. Previously, we have focused on SEL areas of Self and Social Awareness, but our behavioral data reflects a need for a skill based approach to teacher professional development, particularly in the area of behavioral de-escalation, support neutrality, and strategies to de-personalize interactions with students in crisis or those displaying ongoing challenging behavior. -Additionally, our needs assessment reveals a need to increase procedural consistency among team teachers regarding school wide PBIS response procedures, including beginning of class procedures, tardies, cell phone policies, progressive discipline procedures, etc. *Integrating digital resources into daily teaching and learning: -CLMS is always looking for ways to more comprehensively integrate digital resources and technology into daily standards based teaching and learning opportunities. -This includes its use to support more engaging learning opportunities, but also includes integrating teach and digital tools to more effectively and efficiently collect, organize, and respond to student learning outcomes as a result of ongoing assessment.

Behavior Data (referral and EWS Data) is reviewed 2x Monthly in our Student Services Team Meetings.

The team identifies students who have accumulated 5 referrals + EWS. The team prioritizes the most serious cases first for intervention or assignment to the BEP Program and other Behavior/SEL Interventions.

-Based On: Total number of referrals, EWS Data, Type and Seriousness of referral patterns, 504/ESE Status, Frequency and Intensity of behavior

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

Strengthening Parent Participation: -We have surveyed our parents regarding how to better meet their needs in terms of increasing communication and determining how parents would like to be involved. -To date, we have received about 70 responses (survey is still open) that have provided us actionable feedback to increase the quality and opportunities for parents to be involved and stay connected to their child's school.

*Maintaining expectations for collaborative work: -This has been an area of significant improvement this year and will continue into next school year. We have made significant steps with the "Step 0" stage.

-Create multiple communication pathways to highlight parent preferences (60% preferred text) - Create intermittent parent surveys (End Qtr 1, end qtr 2, CNA) to stay attuned to whether we are making adequate progress.

-Increase parent involvement opportunities which had been reduced due during the previous 2 years due to the pandemic. -Implement more parent education opportunities. Parents cited two in the survey that they would like to see (20% were interested in How to support their child to improve academic skills, while 15% indicated they would like to understand the PTC process and their role in it.

Increase opportunities for staff celebrations and gathering (limited this year). -Increase teacher recognition initiatives -Improve processes and procedures to increase awareness and opportunities for teachers to see

how their feedback and input is used to make important decisions at the school. -Provide more intentional leadership training to improve teacher leadership skills, leadership structures and role awareness.