

Charlotte County Public Schools

Deep Creek Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deep Creek Elementary School

26900 HARBOR VIEW RD, Pt Charlotte, FL 33983

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/dce>

Demographics

Principal: James Vernon

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deep Creek Elementary School

26900 HARBOR VIEW RD, Pt Charlotte, FL 33983

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/dce>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

The Deep Creek Family is devoted to inspiring successful leadership in all we do.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are Cubs! Nothing Less Than My Success!

Deep Creek Elementary promotes that we are a school family. We understand that we all come from different backgrounds, cultures and beliefs, but when we come to Deep Creek we support each other, celebrate with each other and treat each other well. Deep Creek Elementary also promotes success. Our school definition of success is doing your personal best and not giving up. All of us have different abilities and skills, but all of us possess the ability to do our individual best and showing GRIT.

We use our three Rs (Ready, Responsible and Respectful) as well as a GRIT Mindset to show our students how a Cub reaches success.

In each grade level at DCES we will strive to have all students achieve proficiency or come as close to proficiency as possible.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vernon, James	Principal	Build relationships with families and community: Parent Connect Call, Newsletter, SAC, PFEP Team, Title I, SIP, Crate, School Events Staff Hiring/Allocations: Evaluations, Curriculum and coaching, Collaborative Planning, Professional Development Student Behavior Assistance, Bully Investigations Assistance, Threat Assessment Team Member Students Data: FSA Scores, Progress Monitoring, L25 Tracking, Interventions, MTSS Team Member Facilities: Custodial, SREF, and repairs School Safety Scheduling: Master Schedule, Duties, Schedules PPC Students Attendance School Budget
Sare, Keli	Assistant Principal	Staff: Hiring, Evaluations, Coaching, Monday Morning Memo Curriculum: Textbooks, Collaborative Planning, Assessment Coordinator, coaching Students: Behavior, Bully Investigations and Training, MTSS Team Member Transportation Bus, bus drills, bus behavior School safety: Fire Drills, Tornado Drills, Crisis Drills, RAPTOR and trainings Paraprofessionals: Meetings and PD PTO Scheduling SPPC Social Media Threat Assessment Team Member
Brown, Marie	Instructional Coach	Lead Teacher Professional Development Assessment Co-Coordinator NET Teachers Assistance with Interventions Cub Club Director Collaborative Planning
Olby, Noelle	School Counselor	Rtl Coordinator 504 Coordinator ELL Coordinator Individual counseling Classroom lessons Check & Connect Co-Coordinator PBIS member Crisis management/Threat/Risk Community/school newsletters Small group counseling

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Riddell, Jacqueline	Instructional Media	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Lentine, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Roy, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Cabral, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Trexler, Jeanie	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Lawson, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Marcus, Trish	Teacher, K-12	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team
Finch, Karon	Teacher, ESE	Program Planner/Literacy Leadership Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/2/2019, James Vernon

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

820

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

6

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

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	148	148	136	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	808
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	27	26	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	15	15	14	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	105	106	107	104	102	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	7	12	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	105	106	107	104	102	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	7	12	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	62%	57%	65%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	57%	58%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	50%	53%	56%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	63%	63%	72%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	54%	62%	43%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	42%	51%	35%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	54%	53%	59%	66%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	73%	69%	4%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	70%	12%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	56%	11%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring data is from Renaissance STAR 360.

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		46/39%	69/58%	78/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged		25/37%	37/51%	44/56%
	Students With Disabilities		8/50%	3/15%	4/18%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students		51/44%	79/67%	79/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged		22/34%	43/61%	42/54%
	Students With Disabilities		4/27%	8/42%	7/33%
	English Language Learners		1/33%	1/33%	1/33%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49/41%	68/56%	78/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/28%	27/42%	32/48%
	Students With Disabilities	5/21%	7/30%	11/42%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30/25%	61/50%	74/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/9%	24/36%	32/48%
	Students With Disabilities	5/21%	10/43%	14/54%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40/35%	62/57%	59/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/31%	24/46%	26/41%
	Students With Disabilities	5/23%	8/38%	9/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/32%	64/59%	74/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/30%	27/51%	32/51%
	Students With Disabilities	7/32%	11/52%	15/58%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53/50%	50/49%	62/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/37%	22/43%	29/51%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	3/15%	7/29%
	English Language Learners	-	-	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/23%	43/41%	45/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/17%	16/31%	19/33%
	Students With Disabilities	2/9%	3/15%	2/8%
	English Language Learners	-	-	0/0%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/39%	39/49%	39/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/25%	16/40%	19/43%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	4/20%	5/24%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22/29%	36/46%	43/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/24%	16/40%	17/38%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	4/20%	3/14%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40/56%	60/76%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/50%	27/71%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	9/47%	
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/100%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	49	59		50	24	25	26				
ELL	53			47							
BLK	44	42		44	17		23				
HSP	60	61		52	28		37				
MUL	43			62							
WHT	76	66		72	51		75				
FRL	64	56	58	58	32	15	45				
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	47	50	48	52	53	46	40				
ELL											
BLK	57	68	73	52	41	33	46				
HSP	70	59		75	72		56				
MUL	80			50							
WHT	75	67	55	80	66	61	61				
FRL	66	62	59	69	62	55	52				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	52	56	53	48	32	32				
BLK	43	54	54	54	46	42	50				
HSP	71	50		73	50		58				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	69	54	64	77	40	27	62				
FRL	59	52	51	66	43	33	57				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

With the past year's circumstances Science and ELA stayed close to the five year average at Deep Creek Elementary. The trend with the decrease in Math proficiency was noticeable.

ELA stayed at 66% which matches the 5 year average

Science was at 56%, which was 2% below the 5 year average. Science scores peaked in 2017 and 2018 at 60% and 61%.

Math scores were 8% lower than the 5 year average of 70%.

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

Math.

The 2021 FSA results showed the lowest percent of Math proficiency at DCES in the last 5 years. It was the lowest number of proficient students by 8% when compared to proficiency in the last 5 years. The decline was especially significant in fourth and fifth grade students.

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

Math Tier 1 instruction needs to be addressed as Math proficiency has been school wide. Math learning gains, especially with L25 students needs to be addressed.

Actions that will take place is Math professional development with a focus on student engagement in math. Also the master schedule will be created to allow an extra 30 minutes of math instruction a day, which will allow time for math interventions.

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

No areas showed improvement when compared to the 2019 FSA School Grades.

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

No areas showed improvement when compared to the 2019 FSA School Grades.

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

The Master Schedule has been built to allow the following intervention time frames.

30 minutes : Math Intervention (In addition to 60 minute math block)

30 minutes: Tier 2 ELA Intervention (In addition to 90 minute ELA block)

30 minutes: Tier 3 ELA Intervention (In addition to 90 minute ELA block)

30 minutes: Science instruction still include on the schedule for all grade levels

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.

Administration attended the Florida Department of Education Cohort of Leadership Academy. The focus of the cohort was on Leading for Instructional Improvement. School walkthroughs will not only be focused during ELA instruction but also Math instruction. The domain of Student Engagement will be the focus, specifically the area of student talk.

The first PD during the back to school week was on math engagement and the PD focus for the year will stay focused on that domain.

Benchmark training for the new ELA curriculum will be the focus for ELA.

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

The CCPS Division of Learning team in conjunction with our school leadership team will conduct learning walks to assist in identifying our current state for growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: DCES had maintained an average of 74% on Math achievement between the years of 2016 - 2019. Last year that proficiency level dropped to 66%. There was a 8% decline from the four year average and a 7% decline from the last results that DCES had on Math achievement in 2019. Also decreasing from the 2019 results were Math Learning gains, which decreased by 22% and Math gains of the Lowest 25%, which decreased by 32%.

Measurable Outcome: The Deep Creek Elementary Math Achievement score will improve to 69%. (3% gain)
The Deep Creek Elementary Math Learning Gains will improve to 56%. (16% gain)
The Deep Creek Elementary Math Gains of the Lowest 25% will improve to 50%. (33% gain)

Monitoring:

1. Professional Development on School PD Day #1 will focus on Math instruction. The focus will be on Student Engagement in Math particularly in the domain of student talk. This will be the monthly Professional Development focus for the duration of the 2021 - 2022 school year.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs during Math instruction looking for examples of instruction using Student Engagement(Talk) techniques.
3. Collaborative Planning will take place bi-weekly to analyze data, monitor interventions, look at future planning and pacing and determine student needs.
4. Once monthly Back to back planning will take for deeper dives into data and extended planning.
5. Monthly L25/Child Talks will allow progress monitoring of L25 students
6. Master Schedule was designed to allow for an extra 30 minute time period for Math Intervention. During this time Do the Math will be used for our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

DCES will focus on Math standards using Critical Concepts, collaborative planning to data mine and prepare future lessons, and professional development with a focus on Marzano elements that promote student engagement, specifically Math talk. DCES has also created a master schedule that created an extra 30 minutes of math instruction. This extra 30 minutes will allow the Do the Math intervention to be added to daily instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will benefit from being involved in their learning and charting their progress using critical concepts. Students also will benefit from using specific math vocabulary and engagement in math instruction. In addition, Lowest 25% students will benefit from the extra 30 minutes and the Do the Math Intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development created and presented on the school first PD day. This PD on Student engagement and Talk will be a continuous focus monthly on Thursday morning PD days.

Person Responsible Keli Sare (keli.sare@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. During classroom walkthroughs administration will look for aspects of student engagement that was crated during the school PD day.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Collaborative planning will take place bi-weekly to focus on math data and to prepare future math instruction based on student needs. Back to back planning periods will take place monthly to allow more time for this process.

Person Responsible Keli Sare (keli.sare@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. Monthly L25 meetings will focus on the progress of L25 students and a Google sheet will be updated and monitored to keep track of these students progress.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: DCES had maintained an average of 67% on ELA achievement between the years of 2016 - 2021, peaking at 72% in 2019. Last year that proficiency level dropped to 69%, which was still 2% higher than the 5 year average, but 3% below the DCES peak ELA score. Also decreasing from the 2019 results were ELA Learning gains, which decreased by 10% and ELA gains of the Lowest 25%, which decreased by 9%.

Measurable Outcome: The Deep Creek Elementary ELA Achievement score will remain at 69%.
The Deep Creek Elementary ELA Learning Gains will improve to 62%. (5% gain)
The Deep Creek Elementary Math Gains of the Lowest 25% will improve to 55%. (2% gain)

Monitoring:

1. Scheduled time on School PD Day #1 will focus on new Benchmark Curriculum.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs during ELA instruction will be looking for examples of instruction using Benchmark "look fors".
3. Collaborative Planning will take place bi-weekly to analyze data, monitor interventions, look at future planning and pacing and determine student needs.
4. Once monthly Back to back planning will take for deeper dives into data and extended planning.
5. Monthly L25/Child Talks will allow progress monitoring of L25 students
6. Master Schedule was designed to create an extra 60 minutes of time allotted for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.
7. Focus of ELA interventions will be on using LLI, SIPPS and Benchmark interventions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: DCES will focus on ELA standards using Critical Concepts, Benchmark pacing, new B.E.S.T standards in K-2, and collaborative planning to work together to become proficient with Benchmark. DCES has also created a master schedule that created an extra 60 minutes of ELA instruction. This extra 60 minutes will allow interventions outside of the 90 minute ELA block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will benefit from being involved in their learning and charting their progress using critical concepts. Students also will benefit from research ELA instruction in new Benchmark curriculum. In addition, Lowest 25% students will benefit from the extra 60 minutes of ELA Intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continuous Professional Development on mastering Benchmark curriculum during data days, C&Is visits, and collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Marie Brown (marie.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. During classroom walkthroughs administration will look for Benchmark "look fors" that were given to administrators implementing the new curriculum.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Collaborative planning will take place bi-weekly to focus on ELA data and to prepare future ELA instruction based on student needs. Back to back planning periods will take place monthly to allow more time for this process.

Person Responsible Keli Sare (keli.sare@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. Monthly L25 meetings will focus on the progress of L25 students and a Google sheet will be updated and monitored to keep track of these students progress.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: DCES had maintained an average of 59% on Science achievement between the years of 2016 - 2021, with a peak of 63% in 2017. Last year that proficiency level dropped to 56%. This was a decline of 1% from the last year tested in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: The Deep Creek Elementary Science Achievement score will improve to 59% (3% gain)

Monitoring: USA Test Prep will be used throughout the school year to determine area of student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marie Brown (marie.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: DCES will continue to promote rigor in Science by following Science standards, protecting at least 30 minute Science blocks in the master schedule, and promoting Marzano instructional techniques during Science instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Improving the instructional techniques of staff and ensuring that lessons match the intent of the Florida Science standards will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master Schedule has allowed 5th grade departmentalization with teachers focusing on Math and Science instruction.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. Science teachers will meet with Science C & I to review focus on Science standards and Science Critical Concepts.

Person Responsible Marie Brown (marie.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Science Coach book consumables will be purchased as an extra resources that will provide supplemental resources that teachers will be able to use for Science instruction.

Person Responsible Marie Brown (marie.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. Teachers will follow the Elevate Science curriculum and CCPS pacing guide.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

5. DCES will implement the "Science Boot Camp" that has been a successful review of Science standards prior to the Science FCAT assessment in May.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Beginning of the year Professional Development day included training for staff that focused on discipline data from the prior year and training to improve student behavior in these areas. Data will be revisited with school staff systematically through monthly staff meetings and core team meetings. Additional support is being provided in classrooms in a Social Emotional plan that is being carried out by school social worker and school counselor.

Last year DCES has two SESIR incidents that involved tobacco. Two SESIR offenses compare favorably to the data statewide.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

DCES has formed a Cub Pride Committee. The goal of the Cub Pride committee is to promote our school vision message that We are Cubs. We are a school family and to act like a Cub you need to remember the 3Rs, which are Ready, Responsible, and Respectful. The Cub Pride committee has created lessons for each teacher that promote these characteristics. They include resources that refresh the expectations at the beginning of each semester. Lessons are shared with all staff members on a Google drive.

Brag tags have also been created that students can earn in their classrooms. Each brag tag can be earned when students show they are Ready, Responsible and Respectful. Each teachers receives a class set of each brag tag.

Cub Pride also assisted with the creation of school wide bulletin boards where students record academic achievements as well as positive behavior choices.

Cub Pride leadership notebooks are also created where students can create goals and record accomplishments.

DCES has also created a Social Emotional Learning plan which requires one Harmony lesson per week,

emphasize SEL strategies during academics, class meetings, Book of the month focusing on a character trait, and a monthly SEL class challenge.

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

The stakeholders for promoting a positive culture at DCES include the entire staff. The entire staff is encourage to take every opportunity to make our students feel that DCES is a special place. We want our students and staff to feel they belong to a school family that understands that we all come from different places and have different opinions, but when we are at DCES will will celebrate with each other, help each other, and respect each other.

Key stakeholders that form our Cub Pride Committee, PBIS Committee, and Core team are:

James Vernon, Principal

Keli Sare, Assistant Principal

Marie Brown, Lead Teacher

Noelle Olby, School Counselor

Marie Navarro, Social Worker

Lauren Berberich, School Psychologist

Parent letter have been written that will be sent home each month to inform families of the character traits that will be the focus. This will allow families to have discussions and complete activities around these traits at home each month.

The information will be shared at SAC meetings throughout the year in the school updates portion of the meetings.