Cunningham Creek Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cunningham Creek Elementary School

1205 ROBERTS RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-ccs.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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	12%

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

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 Caring Cardinals of Cunningham Creek will build strong bodies, hearts, minds, and spirits so we can live, love, learn, and lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cunningham Creek Elementary School is a community of Caring Cardinals, committed to creating an atmosphere that encourages students to develop to their greatest potential. Through our commitment to Communicating, Caring and achieving Excellence, all Cardinals will soar with a passion for lifelong learning.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Jarrell, Edie	Principal
Miller, Kimberly	Assistant Principal
Ritchie, Christa	Instructional Coach
Hallett, Sara	School Counselor

Duties

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

Principal: At Cunningham Creek Elementary, the principal facilitates a focused vision on the use of data-based decision-making, supports the school team with resources and problem-solving options, builds strong partnerships with families and community, and empowers students to take an active role in their learning. She ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, provides professional development to support best practice implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities, The principal serves as a member of the MTSS Problem Solving team. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Assistant Principal: The assistant principal at Cunningham Creek Elementary is an active member of the MTSS team, working to ensure the fidelity of plan implementation and documentation. She provides curriculum resources, intervention support, and serves as the LEA for cases moving to ESE determination. She supports our ESE program teachers and students, manages our school resources, and facilitates schoolwide procedures and practices.

Instructional Literacy Coach: Cunningham Creek Elementary's 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. The coach 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; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team.

Guidance Counselor: At Cunningham Creek Elementary the guidance counselor is also a member of the MTSS team. The counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions such as school counseling and social skills training, the counselor continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	8	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	9	14	2	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	9	14	2	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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?

We saw a dramatic decline in our ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. Traditionally, these students mirror our overall Learning Gains population so this data will be closely analyzed.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Our ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% dropped from 68% to 43%.

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

All of our reporting areas were above the state average, with the exception of our ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%, which was 5% lower than the state average of 48%.

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

Overall, our Math scores are stronger than ELA. Our 4th grade proficiency moved up one point which is a consistent rising trend.

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

Our teachers believe that the rigorous curriculum materials they are using are supporting our students growth and consistent performance in Math.

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	77%	72%	56%	79%	68%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	59%	55%	73%	59%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	48%	70%	53%	46%
Math Achievement	85%	77%	62%	82%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	63%	67%	59%	76%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	58%	47%	77%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	67%	68%	55%	80%	66%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (9)	12 (14)	8 (2)	3 (8)	3 (3)	5 (5)	34 (41)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	0 (1)	3 (3)	1 (1)	11 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (1)	2 (4)	16 (5)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (5)	6 (11)	12 (16)

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**
03	2018	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%
	2017	88%	80%	8%	58%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	79%	74%	5%	56%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	79%	74%	5%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2018	72%	73%	-1%	55%	17%
	2017	81%	75%	6%	53%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	88%	80%	8%	62%	26%
	2017	92%	80%	12%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%
	2017	90%	82%	8%	64%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2018	77%	79%	-2%	61%	16%
	2017	82%	80%	2%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	68%	73%	-5%	55%	13%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

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	40	40	35	59	45	52	38				
ASN	94			94							
BLK	52	53		64	63		50				
HSP	75	63		78	53		69				
MUL	82			91							
WHT	78	56	43	86	63	70	68				
FRL	72	55		81	59	60	65				

	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	58	51	52	61	58	47	40				
ASN	92			100							
BLK	64	82	82	68	59						
HSP	93	80		88	76		69				
WHT	82	65	61	89	78	64	80				
FRL	74	70	78	79	68	65	38				

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	ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
Rationale	Students performing in the lowest 25% are not making adequate learning gains in ELA. We need to provide additional attention and support to close this learning gap.
Intended Outcome	70% of our students in the lowest 25% will show adequate learning gains in ELA.
Point Person	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers and MTSS team will identify the lowest quartile students in reading. 2. These students will be a focus of the PLC process when each team meets weekly. 3. NEST (Nurturing Every Student's Talent) time (30 minute daily block) to provide intervention time and flexible grouping 2. Targeted instruction will be provided in specific areas of weakness. 3. Identified students will be monitored monthly. 4. Data will drive decisions regarding customized learning plan. 5. Students will be paired with mentors (teachers, high school buddies, community members) 6. Mentors will meet regularly with students to provide encouragement and help with goal setting. 7. ESE classes and teachers will be paired with General Ed. classes and teachers to ensure access to academically challenging content.Gen. Ed. 8. Lesson plans are developed with full team collaboration and shared with ESE teachers to support lowest quartile learners.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Miller (kimberly.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	MTSS team will review progress of all lowest quartile students. Tiered plans will be implemented as appropriate, ensuring that adequate supports are in place.
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Students are not making adequate learning gains in Math. Our proficiency scores are stronger, but our students are struggling to make sufficient yearly progress.
Intended Outcome	70% of students will make adequate learning gains in Math.
Point Person	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will review data to determine students' next steps for learning during our weekly PLC sessions. 2. Targeted instruction will be provided in specific areas of weakness during classroom time and NEST. 3. Students will be monitored monthly. 4. Data will drive decisions regarding a need for intervention and additional support. 5. Students will monitor and track their personal goal and growth. 6. ESE classes and teachers will be paired with General Ed. classes and teachers to ensure access to academically challenging content.Gen. Ed. 7. Lesson plans are developed with full team collaboration and shared with ESE teachers.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Miller (kimberly.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	MTSS team will review progress of all students. Tiered plans will be implemented as appropriate, ensuring that adequate supports are in place.
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our Science scores dropped 8 points this year. We need to renew our focus on Science in all grade levels, with a particular focus on STEAM.
Intended Outcome	70% of our 5th grade students will show proficiency in Science.
Point Person	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1. Science VLC Team will review data, create vertical alignment, and facilitate implementation of Science curriculum. 2. Teachers will schedule frequent visits to our Science Lab for hands on experiential learning. 3. Teachers will assess routinely and use data to guide instruction. 4. School wide focus on STEAM will provide multiple opportunities for students to increase understanding of critical Science content.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Miller (kimberly.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Teachers will review student performance evidence to determine areas of weakness. Additional support will be provided to increase students' content knowledge. VLC representatives will work collaboratively to ensure that all Science content standards are covered from Kindergarten - 5th grade.
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #4	
Title	Character and Leadership
Rationale	When students feel empowered and responsible for their choices, they embrace opportunities to show good character and serve in leadership roles. Students who contribute to their school and community are driven by purpose and a desire to make a difference. We must provide opportunities for our students to experience the feeling of being world changers. Setting high expectations and explicitly teaching the principles of good character will result in life-ready students.
Intended Outcome	100% of our students will self-regulate their growth in the areas of academic, social/emotional, and leadership.
Point Person	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1. School wide books of the quarter will support Character Education topics. 2. All students will write, monitor, and reflect on their academic and character goals. 3. All students will serve in a Leadership role within the school and/or the community. 4. Classes will select a representative monthly as the Character Pillar of the Month student 5. Students demonstrating examples of good character will be recognized by staff and awarded recognition. 6. Working with community members, our students will participate in service learning.
Person Responsible	Sara Hallett (sara.hallett@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	MTSS team will track behavior to look for a decline in poor choices. Teachers will monitor student data/leadership notebooks to help students track progress towards goals. Students will review progress during Student Led Conferences with parents.
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)