

Volusia County Schools

Spruce Creek Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sprucecreek/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2018-19 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sprucecreek/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bobcats strive to EXCEL as a diverse community of critical thinkers, problem solvers and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School Belief Statements

We believe education is the shared responsibility of family, students, staff, and community.

We believe all members of our school family should be treated with dignity and respect.

We believe positive communication among students, parents, teachers, and staff is the key to a successful school.

We believe learning is a dynamic lifelong process.

We believe all individuals have a right to a safe and secure environment where trust, caring, encouragement, and support prevail.

We believe in the celebration of our success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richardson, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Campbell, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Pellicer, Megan	Assistant Principal	
Hall, Andrea	Principal	
Weslar, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Weinrich, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Kelly	Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	25	30	19	25	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	2	8	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	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

75

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/17/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	11	23	12	16	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	2	9	4	14	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	2	2	6	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	56%	57%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	53%	31%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	59%	63%	64%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	56%	62%	67%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	43%	51%	48%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	57%	53%	62%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 (0)	30 (0)	19 (0)	25 (0)	20 (0)	31 (0)	150 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)	6 (0)	34 (0)	52 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	31	54	43	32	41	40	23				

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
ELL	55	57		58	73						
ASN	85	77		89	77						
BLK	48	50		65	64						
HSP	47	54		53	56	50					
MUL	85			58							
WHT	69	60	47	72	68	48	63				
FRL	58	60	53	63	64	48	50				
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	25	33	29	29	47	38	22				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	35	29	20	42	38		31				
HSP	56	39		46	44	30	20				
MUL	77			77							
WHT	59	55	44	70	57	42	53				
FRL	53	47	33	62	55	34	39				
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	13	32	32	24	48	36	23				
BLK	35	32		55	73		60				
HSP	43	53		46	69						
MUL	62	64		62	64						
WHT	61	54	30	67	65	46	63				
FRL	49	47	30	58	64	47	53				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	59
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	72
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	
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	61
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Learning gains in the lowest quartile. ELA learning gains were 50% compared to 61% for the whole school population. Math learning gains were 46% compared to 66% for the whole school population. A contributing factor is that the majority of students in the lowest quartile are also students with disabilities.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Hispanic ELA achievement declined 9%. A contributing factor is that last year we had an increase in non-English speaking and limited-English speaking Hispanic students.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math lowest 25th percentile was 46%, which was below the state math lowest 25th percentile of 51%. A contributing factor is that the majority of students in the lowest quartile are also students with disabilities.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science increased 15% and ELA Lowest Quartile increased 12%. Science actions include 2 ERPL's focused on science instruction, STEM Lab focusing on lowest performing standards, analyzed data from SMT's. ELA actions include small group instruction, Waterford and Successmaker, student voice, and monitoring the lowest quartile.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Math lowest quartile achievement
2. Students with disabilities achievement in math
3. ELA lowest quartile achievement
4. Students with disabilities achievement in ELA
5. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Lowest Quartile

Rationale Our 2019 FSA math proficiency for the lowest quartile was 46%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve In math, increase lowest quartile proficiency from 46% to 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Teacher-led small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to Hattie's research.

Action Step

Description

1. Review lowest quartile data to determine proper placement of students in classes and for small group instruction.
2. Facilitate professional learning on finding and creating common formatives and understanding how to evaluate rigor in questions.
3. Administer iReady diagnostic to establish baseline scores.
4. Conduct monthly PLC data chats focused on reviewing progress and student groupings.
5. Academic Coach provides support for implementation through coaching cycles.
6. Provide planning time for teachers to work collaboratively to plan for small group instruction.

Person Responsible Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Social Emotional Learning
Rationale	Student social emotional learning will decrease behaviors and increase learning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce the number of referrals from 520 last year to 495 in the 2019-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Megan Pellicer (mpellice@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement behavioral intervention programs, which will decrease disruptive behaviors and increase positive self- concept.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Behavioral intervention programs have a .62 effect size, decreasing disruptive behaviors has a .34 effect size, and positive self-concept has a .41 effect size. Volusia County School District has provided both Sanford Harmony kits and training for teachers. This year, modules are also available online which pace out the lessons and provide PowerPoints to facilitate teacher usage.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a daily time in the master schedule for Sanford Harmony lessons. 2. Ensure that every teacher has a Sanford Harmony kit for use and can access the SEL module on Canvas. 3. Provide support for teachers and students from the school guidance counselor as needed. 4. Use PBIS rewards to reinforce social skills being taught in Sanford Harmony lessons. 5. Implement tier 2 PBIS as an intervention for students with extra social emotional needs. 6. Monitor the implementation of Sanford Harmony with classroom walk-throughs.
Person Responsible	Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Students with disabilities
Rationale	FSA math proficiency for students with disabilities was 32%. ELA proficiency for students with disabilities was 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase math proficiency from 32% to 41%. Increase ELA proficiency from 25% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to Hattie's research.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review students with disabilities data to determine proper placement of students in classes and for small group instruction. 2. Facilitate professional learning on finding and creating common formatives and understanding how to evaluate rigor in questions. 3. Administer iReady diagnostic to establish baseline scores. 4. Conduct monthly PLC data chats focused on reviewing progress and student groupings. 5. Academic Coach provides support for implementation through coaching cycles. 6. Provide planning time for teachers to work collaboratively to plan for small group instruction. 7. Facilitate master schedule to accomodate push-in services for students with disabilities.
Person Responsible	Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

ELA lowest quartile achievement. This area will use the same strategies as students with disabilities.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Not required

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.

Not required

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

Not required

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.

Not required

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 This section is required for secondary schools, per Sections 1003.413(2)(g),(h), and (j) and 1008.37(4), F.S

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00