Creekside Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Creekside Middle School

6801 AIRPORT RD, Port Orange, FL 32128

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/creekside/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: John Cash E   Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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

Creekside Middle School

6801 AIRPORT RD, Port Orange, FL 32128

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/creekside/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)
Middle School 6-8	No	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Creekside Middle School is a creative, compassionate, and supportive learning community dedicated to encouraging one another in a challenging and academically focused, and innovative environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creekside Middle School is a creative, compassionate, and supportive learning community dedicated to encouraging one another in a challenging and academically focused, and innovative environment.

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
Cash, John	Principal	Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making by promoting the Volusia Proficiency Model. Ensures that educators are implementing the district's Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of the webpage and the VCS Problem Solving/RtI model (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction. For those students who do not respond positively to interventions beyond core, ensure that the school's Problem Solving Team (PST) is accessed as needed. Ensure adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty. Communicates with parents through school newsletters, relevant meetings, and the sharing of the parent link of the VCS Problem Solving/RtI website (under Psychological Services) in order to address the purpose of PS/RtI in meeting student needs and to address frequently asked parental questions. In addition, parents are provided information about PS/RtI at PST meetings. Teachers meet monthly to discuss concerns of individual students during Student Success Team meetings led by grade level guidance counselors. Interventions are brainstormed and then tracked and reported after several weeks of implementation by the teachers. Teacher support systems include the reading coach, administrators, mentors, behavior specialist, social worker, and school psychologist.
Chester, Myra	Assistant Principal	
Mallory, Steffan	Assistant Principal	
Strother, Jay	Assistant Principal	
Sampson, Rebecca	Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	421	369	407	0	0	0	0	1197
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	46	58	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	11
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	74	66	90	0	0	0	0	230

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	20	27	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Wednesday 9/11/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	32	30	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	9	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	29	8	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	33	22	0	0	0	0	76

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	38	53	33	0	0	0	0	124

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	65%	51%	54%	67%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	51%	54%	61%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	42%	47%	47%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	74%	54%	58%	70%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	72%	51%	57%	64%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	42%	51%	52%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	58%	51%	74%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	71%	72%	79%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	421 (0)	369 (0)	407 (0)	1197 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	54 ()	46 ()	58 ()	158 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	74 (0)	66 (0)	90 (0)	230 (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**
06	2019	66%	50%	16%	54%	12%
	2018	60%	48%	12%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	47%	11%	52%	6%
	2018	67%	47%	20%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	67%	50%	17%	56%	11%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	58%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	63%	48%	15%	55%	8%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	47%	13%	54%	6%
	2018	65%	44%	21%	54%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	69%	29%	40%	46%	23%
	2018	56%	37%	19%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	72%	57%	15%	48%	24%
	2018	70%	60%	10%	50%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	68%	8%	71%	5%
2018	80%	66%	14%	71%	9%
Compare		-4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
2018	98%	57%	41%	62%	36%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%
2018	100%	55%	45%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	18	34	32	31	53	43	27	41	62		
ELL	48	59	53	68	70	55					
ASN	86	65		93	85		100	83	100		
BLK	42	45	39	46	57	39	59	58	60		
HSP	59	55	32	63	64	57	47	61	73		
MUL	69	58		74	81	80	90	77	92		
WHT	66	58	46	76	73	62	73	82	82		
FRL	54	53	42	60	63	50	63	65	74		

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	18	37	33	24	47	46	20	48	31		
ELL	8	31	36	36	62						
ASN	90	85		90	80		93	100	93		
BLK	45	55	44	48	55	40	45	70	58		
HSP	54	59	43	57	60	50	60	38	78		

| 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	67	70		68	61		80		80		
WHT	69	64	44	72	69	56	73	83	74		
FRL	55	59	40	58	63	49	62	71	62		
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	24	39	32	26	42	37	33	33	23		
ELL	36	64		43	57						
ASN	88	76		88	74		90	100	90		
BLK	45	39	41	48	45	35	53	65	73		
HSP	67	66	45	56	58	44	82	67	76		
MUL	71	57		69	64		93		79		
WHT	67	61	47	72	65	55	73	80	73		
FRL	55	53	41	57	59	46	62	72	62		

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	66
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
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

English Language Learners	
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	87
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	49
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	57
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	78
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	69
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	59
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Limited knowledge of how to integrate the depth of standards in instruction Strategies for Improvement. A refine systemic practices and provide professional learning to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction. Incorporate instructional strategies to include more technological practices that supports standards-aligned instruction

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Limited knowledge of how to integrate the depth of standards in instruction Strategies for Improvement. A refine systemic practices and provide professional learning to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction. Incorporate instructional strategies to include more technological practices that supports standards-aligned instruction

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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Limited knowledge of how to integrate the depth of standards in instruction Strategies for Improvement. A refine systemic practices and provide professional learning to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction. Incorporate instructional strategies to include more technological practices that supports standards-aligned instruction

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

Math Achievement Gains. 16 percentage point increase. Restart Tutoring offered to all students needing assistance. Offered math tutoring during our PAWS time with instruction provided by students in accelerated math courses. PLC's involving live data of school, district an state assessments

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

Attendance below 90%
Level 1's on the statewide assessment

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

1. Standards aligned instruction
2. Social Emotional Learning
3. Differentiated Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 44% which was below state average of 47%. Our SLT focus is on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroups, SWD which performed at 38% and Black /African American, performed at 49%. The ESSA benchmark is 41% or above.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Lowest 25% by at three percentage points from 44% to 47%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Cash (jecash@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention for students with learning needs,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention for students with learning needs has a .77 effect size according to John Hattie's research.
Action Step	
Description	Data tracking for lower quartile. Teacher knowledge of Lower quartile (LQ) students in their class periods Intensive Reading Student Placement
Person Responsible	Steffan Mallory (samallor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Lowest Quartile performed at 59% which was above the state average. Our SLT focus is on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroups, SWD which performed at 38% and Black /African American, performed at 49%. The ESSA benchmark is 41% or above.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Lowest 25% percentage from 59% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention for students with learning needs
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention for students with learning needs has a .77 effect size according to John Hattie's research.
Action Step	
Description	Data tracking for lower quartile. Teacher knowledge of Lower quartile (LQ) students in their class periods. Professional Learning on Station rotations to include teacher-led small group and standards aligned instruction.
Person Responsible	Steffan Mallory (samallor@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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile	$5,200.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7791 - Creekside Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			7791 - Creekside Middle School	General Fund		$200.00
			Notes: District-Wide			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7791 - Creekside Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
			Notes: Student Recognition and Special Events			
					Total:	**$6,700.00**