

Pinellas County Schools

Clearwater Fundamental Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Clearwater Fundamental Middle School

1660 PALMETTO ST, Clearwater, FL 33755

<http://www.coachman-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Joyner

Start Date for this Principal: 10/15/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 27% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (74%) 2020-21: (76%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (77%) |
| 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 Pinellas 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the Clearwater Fundamental community is to promote highest student achievement through cooperative efforts and a challenging curriculum for our students to be college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student success.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Barthel, Deanna | Other | Dept Head |
| Ritter, Kimberly | Other | Dept. Head |
| Lane, Erin | Guidance Counselor | |
| Bohnet, Bridget | Other | Dept Head Dept. Head |
| Johnston, Kinnan | Other | Dept. Head |
| Rubaii, Elaine | Other | Dept. Head |
| Kurek, Paul | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/15/2017, Stephanie Joyner

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

770

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

3

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

3

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 | 277 | 255 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 767 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 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 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/15/2022

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 | 247 | 256 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 765 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | |

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 | 247 | 256 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 765 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |

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 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | 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 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 | 76% | | | 78% | | | 83% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | | | 62% | | | 69% | 55% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | | | 53% | | | 65% | 47% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 89% | | | 88% | | | 89% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 73% | | | 71% | | | 72% | 52% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | | | 70% | | | 69% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | | | 76% | | | 73% | 51% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 94% | | | 92% | | | 91% | 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 | 80% | 51% | 29% | 54% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 51% | 30% | 52% | 29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -80% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 89% | 55% | 34% | 56% | 33% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -81% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 44% | 38% | 55% | 27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 92% | 60% | 32% | 54% | 38% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 31% | 6% | 46% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -92% | | | | |

| 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 | 73% | 51% | 22% | 48% | 25% |
| 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 | 91% | 68% | 23% | 71% | 20% |
| 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 | 95% | 55% | 40% | 61% | 34% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 56% | 44% | 57% | 43% |

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 | 17 | 34 | 28 | 52 | 52 | 48 | | 65 | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 39 | 36 | 78 | 67 | 67 | 35 | 68 | 96 | | |
| ASN | 100 | 89 | | 94 | 72 | | | | 92 | | |
| BLK | 65 | 69 | 60 | 82 | 75 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 49 | 35 | 84 | 71 | 63 | 61 | 85 | 86 | | |
| MUL | 86 | 64 | 60 | 93 | 79 | | | | 100 | | |
| WHT | 79 | 62 | 54 | 90 | 74 | 69 | 72 | 96 | 89 | | |
| FRL | 69 | 58 | 49 | 86 | 73 | 70 | 61 | 89 | 91 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 42 | 40 | 60 | 58 | 50 | 31 | 62 | | | |
| ELL | 60 | 56 | 43 | 81 | 67 | 68 | 42 | 77 | 86 | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 100 | 83 | | 100 | 94 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 61 | 72 | | 80 | 80 | 82 | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 62 | 47 | 85 | 72 | 78 | 58 | 89 | 84 | | |
| MUL | 82 | 50 | | 86 | 64 | | 100 | | 82 | | |
| WHT | 80 | 62 | 56 | 89 | 70 | 66 | 81 | 92 | 93 | | |
| FRL | 74 | 61 | 53 | 83 | 68 | 72 | 69 | 89 | 83 | | |

| 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 | 55 | 67 | 62 | 55 | 62 | 50 | | 55 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 58 | 52 | 75 | 59 | 54 | 57 | 56 | 89 | | |
| ASN | 100 | 77 | | 100 | 79 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 57 | 46 | 81 | 80 | 73 | | 86 | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 63 | 56 | 79 | 72 | 61 | 58 | 75 | 86 | | |
| MUL | 83 | 86 | 83 | 89 | 81 | 75 | 58 | 100 | 92 | | |
| WHT | 88 | 70 | 71 | 92 | 70 | 72 | 79 | 96 | 94 | | |
| FRL | 69 | 63 | 58 | 81 | 68 | 57 | 59 | 77 | 92 | | |

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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 90 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 760 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | 62 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 89 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 70 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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 | 80 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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?

Math is higher than reading scores across the grade levels. The lowest cell for CFMS is the ELA lowest quartile. The school actually dropped by 4 percent in this cell.

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

Reading/ELA

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 teachers will focus on writing elements. ELA and reading teachers will have more data chats with their students discussing the opportunities for improvement and focus for the student.

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

Civics and math learning gains.

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

We looked at the teacher master schedule based on previous student data for who was teaching what grade levels.

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

Math will have to reflect as what supplemental text/programs to use to support math with the new text book adoption.

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.

PLCs will discuss student works and how they are graded. They will also look at trends showing the works.

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

Align our math classes to higher level learning while offering students in need support. Offer math Extended Learning four days a week. Continue to offer writing boot camps to support ELA writing.

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 Science

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

Our 2022 8th grade level of performance was 72% proficiency as measured by a level 3 or higher on the Science State-wide Science Assessment. In 2021, 8th grade performance was 76%. This was the first year 6th and 7th grade students were given a cumulative end-of-year science exam. On this May 2022 exam, the average 6th grade score was 66%. The average 7th grade score was also 66%.

The problem/gap is because teachers are not intentionally planning enough lessons that include the use of Nature of Science (NOS) standards, Inquiry, and Complex Scientific Thinking Skills. Our scores on N.O.S. standards on cycle tests (all grade levels) are typically lower than scores on life, earth, and physical science standards. If we engage students in more rigorous tasks with a deliberate focus on N.O.S. standards, our overall scores should improve 4%.

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

The percent of all 8th grade students performing at or above grade level will increase to 76% as measured by the Science SSA. The percent of all 6th and 7th grade students performing at or above grade level will be 70% as measured by the end-of-year exam.

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

Teacher checklists of grade-level N.O.S. standards. Classroom observations and feedback. Performance Matters formative data (GAP assessments), summative data (cycle assessments), and feedback. Teachers will monitor and collaborate in PLCs monthly. Teachers will discuss data and remediation strategies with students throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

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

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks using Scientific Thinking Skills and Inquiry Activities

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

Student performance on Nature of Science (N.O.S.) Standards across all grade levels (as seen on cycle/semester test data) has historically trended lower than performance on life science, earth science, or physical science standards. N.O.S. standards can be woven into the teaching of other standards. If we focus on improving these N.O.S. standards, overall scores will improve.

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.

Teachers intentionally plan lessons that will include the use of Nature of Science standards, Scientific Inquiry, and Scientific Thinking Skills.

Person Responsible Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

Grade-level teachers collaborate as much as possible for more school-wide consistency in delivering rigorous, standards-based, N.O.S.-infused lessons.

Person Responsible Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

Strengthen teacher ability to improve literacy in science content area, including the use of grade-appropriate complex texts in science classes and strategies to increase scientific vocabulary.

Person Responsible Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Person Responsible Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to review student data and plan for instructional lessons that include close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible Elaine Rubaii (rubaie@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers to support next steps.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

Teachers will participate in conferences and/or trainings to support Scientific Inquiry and STEM strategies in the classroom.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Participation of teachers, students and administration in CFES Brilliant Pathways conferences, activities and fieldtrips to support college and career knowledge and readiness.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

Participation in STEM Leadership Alliance conference by teachers and administration to support STEM in the classrooms while excelling students.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

The problem/gap is occurring because learning targets and learning tasks are not differentiated to address student readiness, interest, and learning profile of the students with regards to mathematics.

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

The percent of all students' achievement in mathematics will be 85%, as measured by the 2022-2023 FAST Mathematics Achievement by the end of the school year.

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

Teacher will use teacher and district formative/summative assessments along with FAST Mathematics as monitoring tools for student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

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

Incorporating technology, small group and hands on projects that differentiates based on student readiness, interest and/or learning profile.

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

By incorporating technology, assigning hands on projects and teaching in math small group format the CFMS Math Dept will ensure that mathematics is accessible to every student.

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.

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Teachers provide students with a minimum of 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses mathematical readiness, student interest or student choice in learning.

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to address student mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on Differentiation in Mathematics

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Teachers collaboratively plan learning targets and learning tasks to align to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Within PLC and/or common planning, teachers utilize student data to collaboratively plan differentiated learning opportunities that address student readiness, interest, and/or learning profile

Person Responsible Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Level 1/2 and low level 3 sixth grade students will receive extra support through a year long foundational math. This will provide math daily in the block schedule.

Person Responsible Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Our students' level of performance on the 2022 Spring Civics EOC Assessment was 94% earning a level 3 or higher. |
| Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | In 2021, our students' performance was 92%. The problem/gap is occurring because teachers are not consistently scaffolding learning and encouraging higher order thinking. |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | The percentage of students on the 2023 Spring Civics EOC Assessment will increase to 98% earning a level 3 or higher. |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by using the Civics Cycle 1/Cycle 2 data, and by engaging in monthly PLCs in which teachers will discuss data, remediation strategies, how to increase reading/writing in the classrooms and collaborate. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks and reading/writing skills in the classrooms, |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | The Civics EOC requires students to analyze items such as historical quotes, charts, and political cartoons to answer questions, 80% of which are level 2 or 3 in complexity. If we increase student engagement in complex tasks, their Civics EOC scores will improve. If we also increase reading/writing in the classrooms, our Civics EOC scores will improve. |

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.

Teachers will increase the utilization primary source documents at varying complexity levels with appropriate reading/AVID strategies.

Person Responsible Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly Professional Learning Communities to review student data and to plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

Person Responsible Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning.

Person Responsible Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

Teachers increase the utilization of supplemental resources (such as Writing in Response to Text resources created by the district), primary sources, and include short challenging passages that elicit close and critical reading and re-reading.

Person Responsible Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

#4. 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.

The current level of performance is 60% of students making learning gains, as evidenced in FSA 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving proficiency on F.A.S.T ELA 2023 will be 69%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through the use of formative assessments and department focused data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

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

ELA/Reading teachers will focus on co-planning and consistency in our department and work on implementing standards-based lessons aligned to district resources. Teachers will utilize data to evaluate students' progress towards standards mastery and use this information to differentiate and scaffold instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Through focusing on department consistency and collective data analyses, ELA and Reading teachers will be able to meet the needs of each student in a more strategic manner.

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.

Conduct department PLCs evaluating student data and areas of instructional focus.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Administer quarterly department-wide formative assessments specific to grade level and aligned to the focus standards on the district curriculum map.

Person Responsible

Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

Consistently conduct data chats with students and support setting learning goals based on data and formative assessments.

Person Responsible

Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

Develop protocols for student work in ELA/Reading classes.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Communicate the learning focus and share data with students' caregivers - update caregivers on upcoming department assessments and additional opportunities for student learning.

Person Responsible Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

As a department, ELA/Reading teachers will collaborate to foster school-wide enthusiasm for literacy and learning and will collaborate with school administration to celebrate students' successes.

Person Responsible Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

Develop a school-wide protocol for use during daily Literacy block. The ELA/Reading department will monitor students' output.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

All 6th grade students will participate in gifted, intensive reading or journalism to support their reading and writing skills. All level 1/2 7th and 8th grade students will participate in intensive reading classes to support their reading skills. Low level 3 students in 7th grade will participate in AVID.

Person Responsible Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to College and Career Acceleration

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

During the 2022/23 school year all students will receive rigorous instruction for high level courses. All students will be monitored and supported throughout the year to ensure success of the rigorous course.

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

All students will be successful with Adv, Accelerated, Honors, Pre-AP and high school credit courses with a D or better. 90% of the students will show success with a C or better.

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

Progress reports at the mid point of a grading period and report cards at end of the marking period.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

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

Focused note taking.

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

AVID site team will continue to support rigor in the classroom through AVID strategies during department meetings.

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.

Ensure counselor department head is an active member of the the AVID site team.

Person Responsible Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

Plan to confront barriers and address equity in school policies and written documents to ensure that student enrollment in rigorous college preparatory courses reflects school demographics.

Person Responsible Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

Plan, implement, and monitor a high school/college awareness articulation plan for all grade levels.

Person Responsible Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

Engaging strategies, to include focused note taking, that reach a diverse group of learners.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

Gifted teachers will work for 6 hours each during summer to make sure articulation plan for EP students are in place.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

Participation of teachers, students and administration in CFES Brilliant Pathways conferences, activities and fieldtrips to support college and career knowledge and readiness.

Person Responsible Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

Participation in STEM Leadership Alliance conference by teachers and administration to support STEM in the classrooms while excelling students.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Bridging the Gap-Black student achievement

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

Increase engagement of the diverse learner. Our current level of performance in proficiency of the black students couldn't be measured due to the group size, as evidenced by the FSA ELA proficiency scores in 2021.

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

The percent of black students proficient on FAST ELA will be 69%.

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

Through walkthroughs and PLC minute we will be able to see engagement occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

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

Utilize collaborative study groups and focused notetaking.

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

The gap is occurring due to the lack of engagement in the classrooms.

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.

Provide culturally relevant strategies/equity strategies to increase engagement and improve grades in the ELA/Rdg classrooms.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA/Rdg teachers will implement culturally relevant instructional practices in the classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA/Reading teachers will provide an opportunity for black students to participate in weekly ELP opportunities by recruiting and targeting resources.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Teachers analyze data in monthly PLC to discuss how they can differentiate to get engagement in the classrooms.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Provide culturally relevant strategies/equity strategies to increase engagement and improve grades in the ELA/Rdg classrooms.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA/Rdg teachers will have access to real time data specific to the black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Increase engagement of the students with disabilities. Our current level of performance is 37% of the SWD showed a level 3 or higher as evidenced by the FSA ELA proficiency scores in 2022.

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

The percent of students with disabilities showing proficiency on FAST ELA will be 45%.

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

Through walkthroughs and PLC minutes we will be able to see engagement occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

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

Utilize collaborative study groups and focused notetaking.

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

The gap is occurring due to the lack of engagement in the classrooms.

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.

Provide strategies to increase engagement and improve grades in ELA/Rdg classrooms.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA/Rdg teachers will implement instructional practices in the classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, and monitoring with feedback.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA/Rdg teachers will provide an opportunity for students with disabilities to participate in weekly ELP opportunities by recruiting students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

ELA department head will ensure ELA/RDG teachers will have access to real time data specific to students with disabilities in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will use in the classroom, collaborative study groups and focused notetaking to increase engagement.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

Students will set goals and track data.

Person Responsible Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

n/a

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.

CFMS will make sure that student expectations are clearly defined, communicated, agreed upon and implemented by staff and explicitly taught to the student. By doing this, students will have a clear understanding of the expectations. To help parents understand the student and family expectations, voluntary orientations will be offered to the families.

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

During the summer students and parents will be given an opportunity to participate in orientations to the school regarding procedures and policies. Teachers will be trained during preschool on the Fundamental way for demerits, detentions, parent contact, expectations for both teachers and families. During the first two weeks of school teachers will review classroom/school expectations. Signage will ensure as a reminder of those expectations.