

St. Johns County School District

Creekside High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Creekside High School

100 KNIGHTS LN, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Steve McCormick

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	5%
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 (79%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (73%) 2014-15: A (83%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCormick, Steve	Principal	
Kasting, Troy	Assistant Principal	
Jasper, Haley	Assistant Principal	
Carnall, Linda	Assistant Principal	

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	598	624	578	491	2291	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	37	33	39	149	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	27	46	27	151	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	18	21	69	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	27	20	92	
	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	24	16	24	20	84

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	1	6	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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

10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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	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 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	23	28	15	32	98

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	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 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	23	28	15	32	98

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	83%	74%	56%	84%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	51%	62%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	42%	57%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	86%	73%	51%	78%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	74%	58%	48%	58%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	55%	45%	46%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	93%	86%	68%	92%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	88%	73%	92%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	598 (0)	624 (0)	578 (0)	491 (0)	2291 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	40 (68)	37 (44)	33 (42)	39 (68)	149 (222)
One or more suspensions	51 (40)	27 (26)	46 (19)	27 (27)	151 (112)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (9)	25 (31)	18 (18)	21 (34)	69 (92)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	20 (24)	25 (20)	27 (15)	20 (31)	92 (90)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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
09	2019	83%	75%	8%	55%	28%
	2018	82%	74%	8%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	83%	74%	9%	53%	30%
	2018	84%	76%	8%	53%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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
2019	92%	87%	5%	67%	25%
2018	89%	84%	5%	65%	24%
Compare		3%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	88%	4%	70%	22%
2018	94%	87%	7%	68%	26%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	79%	1%	61%	19%
2018	73%	79%	-6%	62%	11%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	81%	7%	57%	31%
2018	84%	77%	7%	56%	28%
Compare		4%			

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	40	46	39	60	61	53	74	71		97	43
ELL					64						
ASN	96	74		94	72		100	95		100	89
BLK	69	58	42	70	63	46	81	82		100	52
HSP	73	62	55	80	69	55	91	84		98	66
MUL	92	69		89	83		89				
WHT	84	66	64	88	75	74	94	92		99	72
FRL	68	52	44	85	83	91	88	91		100	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	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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	851
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
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	90
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	66
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	73
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	84
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	81
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	75
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 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. Contributing factors are unknown based on previous year's data

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

Social Studies Achievement was our greatest declining data component from the previous year with a 3% decrease from the previous year. This is not a trend for CHS so factors are unknown. However, the decline in SWD achievement could be a possible contributing factor.

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 Achievement was the component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a increase of 35%. Creekside's commitment to the PLC process with the algebra 1 and geometry teams is the largest contributor to this factor.

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

Math Learning Gains was the data component that showed the most improvement at CHS with an increase of 21%. Creekside's commitment to the PLC process with the algebra 1 and geometry teams is the largest contributor to this factor.

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

One potential area of concern for CHS is the increase of Level 1's on statewide assessment increasing in some grade levels.

Another potential area of concern for CHS is the number of students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Continuous improvements in math learning gains
2. Continuous improvements for ELA learning gains
3. Supports for SWD in the areas of math and ELA lowest 25%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Lowest 25th Percentile

Rationale Creekside High School lowest 25% in math increased from 55% to 69% in the 2018-2019 school year

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Creekside High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in math from 69% to 71%, as measured by Florida Standards Assessment
End of Course Exams in Algebra 1 and Geometry.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Team collaboration using the Professional Learning Community Model

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Teams that operate via PLCs collaborate building lessons that align with essential standards, review student data and increase student achievement

Action Step

Description

1. Algebra and Geometry teams will collaborate to increase the number of common formative assessments used to track student progress
2. Algebra and Geometry teams will review student data ongoing within a unit to determine student needs based on developed common formative assessments.
3. Algebra and Geometry teams will use data from common formative assessments to share the remediation necessary for identified students and will implement reassessment tools
4. Algebra classes will work with a consult period teacher to provide additional supports for students identified in the lowest 25% for math.
5. Algebra and Geometry teams will work closely with 2 tutors to provided remedial supports to students in the lowest 25 %
6. Algebra and Geometry teams will utilize the IXL math computer program to reinforce concepts for students that do not master the essential standards.

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

#2	
Title	Reading Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Creekside High School lowest 25% in reading increased from 59% to 62% in the 2018-2019 school year
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Creekside High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in reading from 62% to 64%, as measured by Grade 9/10 ELA Florida Standards Assessments. A major area of focus will be with our students with disability subgroup and their gains achieved.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	(1) Team collaboration using the Professional Learning Community Model and (2) use of Achieve 3000 Reading Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	(1) Teams that operate via PLCs collaborate building lessons that align with essential standards, review student data and increase student achievement (2) Achieve 3000 provides students additional resources for teachers to progress monitor students reading gains throughout the year.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA teams will collaborate to increase the number of common formative assessments used to track student progress 2. ELA teams will review data ongoing within a unit to determine student needs based on developed common formative assessments. 3. ELA teams will use data from common formative assessments to share the remediation necessary for identified students and will implement reassessment tools 4. 10th grade English classes will work with a consult period teacher to provide additional supports for students identified in the lowest 25% for Reading. 5. Students in the lowest 25% will be placed in an intensive reading class that will utilize the Achieve 3000 program on a regular basis as a means for progress monitoring and literacy skills development
Person Responsible	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Parent/Guardian Communication
Rationale	Parents continue to request ongoing communication supports as reported by the SAC survey results
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In order 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%, Creekside High School will effectively communicate with parents/guardians on a weekly basis,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Online or digital communication
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Current society norms include the use of technology as a primary means of communication
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All teachers will continue to use Schoology to communicate student work 2. All teachers will update student work in Home Access Center (HAC) at least once a week 3. The school newsletter will be published weekly with detailed information on happenings at CHS 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.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).