

Nassau County School District

Callahan Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Callahan Middle School

450121 OLD DIXIE HWY, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Shumate

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2021

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (66%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Nassau 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Callahan Middle School

450121 OLD DIXIE HWY, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

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	No	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

Nassau County's mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

At Callahan Middle School our mission is to provide students with high quality educational experiences that stimulate their desire to gain knowledge and equip students with the necessary skills to become productive citizens in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A caring faculty and staff at Callahan Middle School is committed to the facilitation of authentic student achievement through academic, social-emotional, and physical/developmental growth.

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
Shumate, Kim	Principal	
Goodwin, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	
Way, Kyanne	School Counselor	
Lundquist, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Berner, Amber	Reading Coach	
Schinella, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	
Stevenson, Sheryl	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/10/2021, Kimberly Shumate

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.*

12

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

6

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

8

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	229	232	244	0	0	0	0	705	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	63	52	0	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	11	0	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	33	49	0	0	0	0	94	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	33	0	0	0	0	56	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	19	0	0	0	0	37	

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	14	21	23	0	0	0	0	58	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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	216	242	242	0	0	0	0	700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	106	101	0	0	0	0	287
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	22	15	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	36	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	21	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	14	0	0	0	0	53

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	17	31	33	0	0	0	0	81

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	216	242	242	0	0	0	0	700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	106	101	0	0	0	0	287
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	22	15	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	36	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	21	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	14	0	0	0	0	53

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	17	31	33	0	0	0	0	81

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	64%	64%	50%				63%	64%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						51%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						47%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	80%	34%	36%				73%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						57%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						54%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	77%	53%				62%	64%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	58%	58%				70%	72%	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	66%	63%	3%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
08	2022					
	2019	61%	65%	-4%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	79%	71%	8%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	69%	76%	-7%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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	61%	60%	1%	48%	13%
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	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%
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	88%	74%	14%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	57%	-57%

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	22	32	27	47	44	46	35	66	77		
BLK	44	47		50	50						
HSP	71	65		82	62		70	80			
MUL	55	45		81	83						
WHT	64	51	41	81	59	55	76	90	85		
FRL	55	44	35	72	52	49	70	81	81		
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	26	27	21	53	39	40	35	61	36		
BLK	50	47		63	43						
HSP	72	48		84	52						
MUL	71	56		88	63						

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
WHT	66	51	38	80	52	52	73	89	77		
FRL	55	45	33	70	49	46	62	84	69		
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	29	44	47	50	50	51	41	45			
BLK	57	58		43	50						
HSP	52	47		70	56						
MUL	65	57		71	65	64	82	62			
WHT	63	51	49	74	57	56	62	70	54		
FRL	56	48	46	67	55	52	56	66	43		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	48
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	72
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	66
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	67
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	60
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?

After reviewing all data components, CMS remained the same or increased proficiency/achievement, learning gains, and lowest quartile learning gains for all core subjects with the exception of ELA proficiency. CMS ELA proficiency decreased from 66% to 64%. The overall federal index for SWD subgroup increased from 38% in 2021 to 44% in 2022. The overall federal index for the other subgroups was also well above the federal index.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency. Particularly 7th and 8th grade ELA 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?

Contributing factors include student attendance, teacher turnover, and the need for additional literacy training/professional development related to the Science of Reading.

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

The data components that showed the most progress from 2021 to 2022 were related to student learning gains and Science proficiency. Specifically they include:

ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% increased from 36% to 42%;

Math Learning Gains increased from 53% to 59%;

Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% increased from 52% to 54%; and,

Science (8th grade proficiency) increased from 72% to 74%

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

The contributing factors to this improvement include the following:

Emphasis and consistent use of evidence-based instructional practices by our SWD support teachers.

Consistent use of engagement student strategies and student monitoring strategies.

Consistent use of progress monitoring data to determine individual student academic needs.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning include:

Professional development for all teachers related to learning and teaching the new B.E.S.T. ELA and Math standards.

Professional development for all ELA teachers to develop literacy expertise.

Continue training new and struggling teachers in the use of evidence-based instructional practices.

Continue to use progress monitoring data (F.A.S.T. and STAR) to meet the needs of all students.

Recruiting and retaining high quality teachers.

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.

Professional development opportunities have been planned by the district and the school to help teachers learn and teach the new ELA and Math standards. These trainings will include evidence-based instructional practices like explicit and systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, differentiated instruction, manipulatives, and other components of Universal Design for Learning components.

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

Sustaining improvement means implementing the strategies described in section f above.

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 ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Callahan Middle School has identified our ELA instruction as an area of focus because 2022 FSA data indicated improvement is needed in the area of ELA proficiency. Proficiency decreased from 66% in 2021 to 64% in 2022. Specifically, 7th ELA proficiency decreased from 63% in 2021 to 56% in 2022 and 8th ELA proficiency decreased from 71% in 2021 to 68% in 2022. 6th ELA proficiency increased from 58% in 2021 to 66% which for an area of focus last year.

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

The measurable outcome CMS plans to achieve is an increase in ELA proficiency, specifically for 7th and 8th grade, by 3-5%.

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using progress monitoring data from STAR Reading assessments and F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for the Area of Focus include: Systematic and explicit reading instruction (comprehension and vocabulary) using core curriculum that aligns with the standards; scaffolded and differentiated instruction in teacher-led small groups; incorporating intervention curriculum that meets the needs of the lowest 25% or readers (like the Sonday System for dyslexia and decoding); evidence-based training on the Science of Reading by the regional literacy directors for our reading coach and team leads.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for

These strategies have been chosen due to the strong evidence of their efficacy. The effect size of each of these strategies are greater than .4 and they can be and have been implemented within our instructional model and master schedule.

selecting this strategy.**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.

1. Refine instructional model that delivers explicit, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction in whole and small group settings to meet the needs of all learners.
2. Provide professional development to teachers and teacher leaders related to the Science of Reading.
3. Provide teachers collaborative planning time to discuss and model evidence-based strategies, plan standards-based lessons, and analyze student data.
4. Use supplemental curriculum for lowest quartile students to close learning gaps and address learning disabilities like dyslexia (Sonday System).
5. Provide targeted after school tutoring.
6. Use progress monitoring data to make adjustments to instruction and action steps as needed to meet the needs of all students.

Person**Responsible**

Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.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.

CMS has a Positive Behavior System which includes a behavior expectations matrix, a clearly defined discipline plan/flowchart, and a daily advisory program. Because positive relationships are key to a positive environment, the advisory program at our school is grade specific to build a culture of respect and trust among students and staff. Every day teachers lead discussions related to the specific needs of each grade level on topics that include character building, respect, responsibility, healthy social and emotional relationships, career choices, completing job applications, and other real-world skills. High expectations and mutual respect are core values on our campus.

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

CMS provides a supporting environment for parents to partner with school staff to ensure their students' success. Multiple means of communication provide parents with a wealth of knowledge and resources to assist students' academic progress. Families are encouraged to participate in after-school events and educational programs. Parents are also encouraged to join our School Advisory Council and participate in our school voluntary corps which is led by a parent.

In addition to parents, school staff, and students. CMS partners with community organizations like Starting Point of Nassau county to provide social and emotional support, as well as, tobacco abstinence counseling

support to students weekly. CMS also partners with the non-profit organization Take Stock in Children who provide mentors for qualified students. CMS also partners with a number of faith-based organizations in the community to provide clothing, hygiene, and special event financial support to indigent students.