Cunningham Creek Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cunningham Creek Elementary School

1205 ROBERTS RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-ccs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Katie O'connell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (77%)
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

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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	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 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jarrell, Edie	Principal	Lead the school in determining areas of focus Provide resources and remove obstacles Support the faculty and staff Partner with the families and community Encourage and motivate students Serve on MTSS Problem Solving Team
Miller, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school initiatives Focus and support the ESE programs Provide school wide guidance and support to all stakeholders Facilitate the transportation and safety programs Serve on MTSS Problem Solving Team
Ritchie, Christa	Instructional Coach	Provide training, coaching, and support to all instructional staff Facilitate mentoring program Serve on MTSS Problem Solving Team Guide and direct curricular decisions and instructional frameworks
Hallett, Sara	School Counselor	Serve on MTSS Problem Solving Team Oversee ELL and 504 programs Support students, faculty, and families with social/emotional/mental health concerns Facilitate the school wide Character Counts program

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	81	99	99	76	88	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	5	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	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 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	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	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 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	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	80%	75%	57%	82%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	67%	58%	69%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	59%	53%	68%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	77%	63%	88%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	69%	62%	77%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	59%	51%	64%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	72%	53%	76%	69%	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	81 (0)	99 (0)	99 (0)	76 (0)	88 (0)	109 (0)	552 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (3)	8 (12)	5 (8)	2 (3)	4 (3)	4 (5)	31 (34)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	2 (5)	0 (2)	1 (0)	1 (3)	0 (1)	5 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (14)	3 (2)	6 (16)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (6)	4 (6)	9 (12)

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	84%	78%	6%	58%	26%	
	2018	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	87%	77%	10%	58%	29%	
	2018	79%	74%	5%	56%	23%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					
05	2019	77%	76%	1%	56%	21%	
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	55%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	92%	82%	10%	62%	30%	
	2018	88%	80%	8%	62%	26%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%	
	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
05	2019	91%	80%	11%	60%	31%	
	2018	77%	79%	-2%	61%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		14%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%	
	2018	68%	73%	-5%	55%	13%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
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	46	64	59	51	59	50	47				

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
ASN	92			83							
HSP	76	86		80	85						
WHT	79	73	72	88	78	76	74				
FRL	75	75		79	71						

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 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				

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 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				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	76
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	88
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	77
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.

Our SWD students scored 46% in ELA Achievement, up from 40% the previous year. We serve a population of students who are challenged to show proficiency due to their disabilities. This year, we have implemented a multi-layered system of supports for ESE students as well as our MTSS students. We continue to strive to appropriately identify the best means to determine mastery for these students.

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

We dropped 4% in Math-4th Grade from 91% to 87%. The decline represents a different group of students and a marginal shift in their performance on this instrument.

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.

We are above the state average in all categories - the closest gap is 21% above the state in 5th grade ELA. We are focused on our 5th grade ELA instructional practices this year to exceed this number next year.

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

We grew in all 7 reporting categories for a total of 74 points gained. Our greatest growth was in ELA LQ where we grew from 43% to 68% - a total of 25 points in this category. We attribute the gains to the implementation of the PLC model and the flexible grouping of students. Customizing all learning paths, based on current data yielded tremendous success for all of our students.

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

We are focused on attendance of our medically able students. Historically, we have been challenged by families who have varied priorities that encroach on consistent school attendance.

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

1. 3% gains in SWD ELA in all grade levels
2. 3% gains in ELA LQ in all grade levels
3. 3% gains in Math LQ in all grade levels
4. 3% gains in ELA in all grade levels
5. 3% gains in Math in all grade levels

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	It is important that we commit to helping each and every student reach their full potential. By focusing on all students, we will ensure that each student makes gains, regardless of their current academic level.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is for each of our student groups to increase 3%, as measured on the state assessment in Spring, 2020. 3% growth for overall ELA Learning Gains 3% growth for overall ELA Learning Gains -SWD 3% growth for overall ELA Learning Gains - LQ
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collective teacher efficacy - PLC - unpacking standards, creating authentic assessments, creating flexible groups based on specific deficits or enrichment needs; RtI - MTSS process - NEST & WIN groups (flexibly-grouped students by skill) Differentiated Instruction (within class and among grade level) Classroom culture supporting more complex thinking in reading and writing
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie's research, as presented in Visible Learning shows that Collective teacher efficacy is the highest yield effect on student performance. We implement this collective partnership through our PLC process. PLC@Work is a research-based process of using data to drive instruction. Grouping students for explicit skill instruction is another high yield strategy. The greatest resource is our human capital - our grade level teams sharing students and building groups by standard, student, skill, & strategy.

Action Step

Description	1. Review individual student data 2. Use data to build NEST groups (Nurturing Every Student's Talents) 3. Implement strategic and specific instruction in skills and strategies 4. Monitor and assess for progress and need for remediation 5. Repeat cycle throughout the year
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	MATH Learning Gains
Rationale	It is important that we commit to helping each and every student reach their full potential. By focusing on all students, we will ensure that each student makes gains, regardless of their current academic level.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is for each of our student groups to increase 3%, as measured on the state assessment in Spring, 2020. 3% growth for overall MATH Learning Gains 3% growth for overall MATH Learning Gains -SWD 3% growth for overall MATH Learning Gains - LQ
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collective teacher efficacy - PLC - unpacking standards, creating authentic assessments, creating flexible groups based on specific deficits or enrichment needs; RtI - MTSS process - NEST & WIN groups (flexibly-grouped students by skill) Differentiated Instruction (within class and among grade level) Classroom culture supporting students using strategies to interpret word problems Use of exit ticket to determine next steps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie's research, as presented in Visible Learning shows that Collective teacher efficacy is the highest yield effect on student performance. We implement this collective partnership through our PLC process. PLC@Work is a research-based process of using data to drive instruction. Grouping students for explicit skill instruction is another high yield strategy. The greatest resource is our human capital - our grade level teams sharing students and building groups by standard, student, skill, & strategy.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review individual student data 2. Use data to build NEST groups (Nurturing Every Student's Talents) 3. Implement strategic and specific instruction in skills and strategies 4. Monitor and assess for progress and need for remediation 5. Repeat cycle throughout the year
Person Responsible	Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Student Leadership and Empowerent - Character Development
Rationale	When students take ownership and responsibility for their growth, learning, and choices, they build confidence, self-efficacy, and develop a greater enthusiastic investment in developing to their fullest potential. Character is built through the daily choices we make. Each lead us in the direction of our destiny.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Each student will demonstrate good character, develop positive leadership traits, and dedicate themselves to setting and meeting their goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Edie Jarrell (edie.jarrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) has documented over two decades of compelling research demonstrating the positive effect of SEL on both academic and behavioral outcomes. Additionally, Hattie's research notes the dramatic increase of student academic and behavioral success through the empowerment of student-owned learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By implementing a culture of student empowerment, leadership, and good character, we are developing life-ready students.

Action Step	
Description	1. School wide Character Counts! Program - Cardinals with Character 2. Student Leadership Notebooks - goals and data; Student Led Conferences 3. Opportunities for student leadership - every student serving in a leadership role 4. Explicit instruction and monitoring of behavioral expectations - school wide SEL 5. Service Learning - multiple clubs to build community and provide an outlet for kindness and generosity
Person Responsible	Sara Hallett (sara.hallett@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).

.