

St. Johns County School District

Creekside High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	12
Budget to Support Goals	13

Creekside High School

100 KNIGHTS LN, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-chs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	7%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

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 mission of Creekside High School is to provide students with an opportunity to achieve academic, athletic, fine arts and extra-curricular excellence, within a safe and secure learning environment. Creekside High school staff and students will strive to model and support the six pillars of character counts. The six pillars of character are Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring and Citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Creekside High School is to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
McCormick, Steve	Principal
Kasting, Troy	Assistant Principal
Jasper, Haley	Assistant Principal
Carnall, Linda	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, manages the school budget, collaborates with school leadership of feeder schools, manage school communications, conducts teacher evaluations, leads planning for school-wide systems of intervention and professional development. Shared decision making is facilitated through the PLC process, teams of teachers work collaboratively in cycles of inquiry to ensure student learning. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Assistant Principals: Assist the principals with duties as needed including teacher observations, testing, LEA, textbooks, facilitating the MTSS process, guidance operations, school-wide discipline plans, school technology, etc.

Instructional Literacy Coach: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	44	42	68	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	26	19	27	112
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	31	18	34	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	15	31	90

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	28	15	32	98

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	1	0	0	0	1
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	4

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	33	50	72	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	15	11	20	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	22	24	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	19	21	28	94

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	16	16	29	82

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	33	50	72	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	15	11	20	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	22	24	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	19	21	28	94

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	16	16	29	82

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Math learning gains were our lowest performing data component. This is not a trend for CHS based on previous year's data, however, always an area that needs improvement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math Learning Gains were our greatest declining data component from the previous year with a 5% decrease from the previous year

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Our Math Achievement component is our largest gap when compared to the state level with a 29% difference. Math Learning Gains was the closest to the state average at 5% above the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Our data component that showed the most improvement from last year is the Math Lowest 25th Percentile. No this is not a trend from previous years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Creekside focused on our goals by implementing the following action steps:

- Math teachers received professional development on classroom assessments with the rigor of the FSA EOC assessments
- Teachers worked in a PLC format to craft common formative assessments and used the results to craft interventions.

School Data

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	67%	56%	83%	71%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	59%	53%	61%	56%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	44%	60%	48%	38%
Math Achievement	80%	66%	51%	77%	68%	43%
Math Learning Gains	53%	55%	48%	54%	51%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	45%	55%	45%	38%
Science Achievement	90%	78%	67%	93%	88%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	81%	71%	88%	85%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	68 (45)	44 (33)	42 (50)	68 (72)	222 (200)
One or more suspensions	40 (56)	26 (15)	19 (11)	27 (20)	112 (102)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (5)	31 (25)	18 (22)	34 (24)	92 (76)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	24 (26)	20 (19)	15 (21)	31 (28)	90 (94)

Grade Level Data

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
09	2018	82%	74%	8%	53%	29%
	2017	82%	74%	8%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	84%	76%	8%	53%	31%
	2017	83%	73%	10%	50%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	89%	84%	5%	65%	24%
2017	92%	86%	6%	63%	29%
Compare		-3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	94%	87%	7%	68%	26%
2017	91%	86%	5%	67%	24%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	73%	79%	-6%	62%	11%
2017	76%	78%	-2%	60%	16%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	84%	77%	7%	56%	28%
2017	87%	78%	9%	53%	34%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

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	55	53	46	58	41	24	71	79		92	24
ASN	96	79		96	75		100	95		100	78
BLK	67	43	44	65	26	17	71	100		100	61
HSP	79	62	71	83	44	60	82	88		91	65

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
MUL	92	67		84	56		100				
WHT	84	66	58	80	55	57	91	94		98	72
FRL	80	62	66	71	47	42	87	94		88	57
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	45	44	43	52	50	33	61	59		76	50
ASN	90	70		91	67		100	96		88	62
BLK	69	59	57	55	44	35	91	91		96	45
HSP	78	60	52	74	55	39	80	84		94	81
MUL	100	71		76	80						
WHT	84	62	57	80	58	47	93	92		96	75
FRL	70	49	37	73	57	46	81	79		89	61

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Creekside High School math learning gains decreased from 58% in 2016-2017 school year to 53% in the 2017-2018 school year.
Intended Outcome	Creekside High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 53% to 58%, as measured by Florida Standards End of Course Exams in Algebra 1 and Geometry.
Point Person	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	<p>Math teachers will collaborate within PLC teams to create common formative assessments aligned to the rigor of the FSA EOC. They will administer these assessments and analyze data to guide instruction.</p> <p>Math teachers will collaborate within PLC teams and utilize the technology tool GradeCam to analyze real time assessment data among the math teachers and identify students in need of further remediation or acceleration on mastery of state standards.</p> <p>Math teachers have all been provided a common planning period. In addition, the algebra team will have a secondary class period intended to provide extra remediation during the school day.</p>
Person Responsible	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<p>Administration will meet with each PLC for data chats to review assessments and provide feedback</p> <p>Data from team common formative assessments will accurately identify students in need of remediation and will be used to guide instruction in math</p>
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Activity #2	
Title	Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains
Rationale	District focus for all schools in SJCSO is to improve learning gains in the lowest 25%
Intended Outcome	Creekside High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in reading from 59% to 61%, as measured by Grade 9/10 ELA Florida Standards Assessments.
Point Person	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	ELA Teacher will receive professional development regarding FSA assessments and practice writing assessments aligned to the rigor of these assessments ELA teachers will collaborate within PLC teams to create common formative assessments aligned to the rigor of FSA. They will administer these assessments and analyze data (with the use of GradeCam) to analyze data to guide instruction. ELA teachers will develop ways to systemically intervene when formative assessment shows students are not mastering standards
Person Responsible	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will meet with each PLC for data chats to review assessments and provide feedback Data from team common formative assessments will accurately identify students in need of remediation and will be used to guide instruction in math
Person Responsible	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3

Title Parent/Guardian Communication

Rationale Parents report that tools the school uses can be confusing, or that they do not know how to access them or set them up (i.e. Remind, HAC, Schoology, Blackboard etc)

Intended Outcome Creekside High School will effectively communicate student progress with parents/guardians on a weekly basis, to increase the percentage of parents answering "Yes/Always" or "Frequently" to the statement "the communication about my child's progress is adequate" on the annual survey by 5%

Point Person Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

All teachers will learn to use Schoology to post upcoming assignments/deadlines on the calendar.

Description Students will be trained within the first month of school to use Schoology for assignments, etc.
CHS administration will communicate directly to parents using School Messenger, and on the CHS website, information about how parents can use HAC, Schoology, Remind, etc. to remain in communication with the school in various areas regarding the success of their student at CHS.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration will periodically check teacher schoology pages to ensure information is updated in a timely manner and provide feedback directly to teachers for improvement
Parents and students will be polled through the year for their use of various communication tools provided by the school

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------