Durbin Creek Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Durbin Creek Elementary School

4100 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Mccormick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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	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 English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (85%) 2014-15: A (87%)
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

Durbin Creek Elementary School

4100 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-dce.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	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

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.

Making positive contributions to society by expanding minds to explore our expanding world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Durbin Creek Elementary School will promote a positive educational environment conducive to learning. We will promote respect, caring and a sense of community. Durbin Creek Elementary will develop an atmosphere where students develop a strong desire to learn, excel, and develop excellent character.

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
Walker, LaVerne	Assistant Principal	
Labaw, Renee	School Counselor	
Stanton, Katrina	Instructional Coach	
Fuller, Angela	Principal	

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
Number of students enrolled	135	133	125	157	136	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	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		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/25/2019

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	2	6	9	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	6	9	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	84%	75%	57%	84%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	67%	58%	64%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	59%	53%	56%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	77%	63%	87%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	69%	62%	69%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	59%	51%	64%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	72%	53%	74%	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	135 (0)	133 (0)	125 (0)	157 (0)	136 (0)	149 (0)	835 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (2)	1 (6)	0 (9)	1 (8)	3 (4)	2 (4)	7 (33)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (4)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	3 (3)	6 (13)	12 (19)

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	88%	78%	10%	58%	30%
	2018	84%	78%	6%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	77%	12%	58%	31%
	2018	79%	74%	5%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	74%	76%	-2%	56%	18%
	2018	74%	73%	1%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	90%	82%	8%	62%	28%	
	2018	91%	80%	11%	62%	29%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%	
	2018	87%	83%	4%	62%	25%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		-6%					
05	2019	80%	80%	0%	60%	20%	
	2018	93%	79%	14%	61%	32%	
Same Grade Comparison		-13%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	70%	73%	-3%	53%	17%	
	2018	88%	73%	15%	55%	33%	
Same Grade Comparison		-18%					
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	58	65	56	64	70	69	42				
ASN	91	75		96	88		82				
HSP	68	58	38	80	70	67	47				
MUL	79			79							
WHT	87	75	66	88	69	56	73				
FRL	69	63	41	70	66	58	45				

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	50	54	47	66	56	45	77				
ASN	93	72		97	82		100				
HSP	60	55	38	83	57		64				
WHT	80	62	44	91	74	79	88				
FRL	55	51	37	78	63	65	61				

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	63	54	44	71	60	71	23				
ASN	97	83		97	83						
BLK	82			80							
HSP	67	54	50	86	67		67				
WHT	85	63	54	86	68	63	76				
FRL	64	53	35	85	62	64	68				

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	72
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	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
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	86
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	61
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	79
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	73
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.

Our 5th grade Science data was our lowest component and our most significant decline from the previous year. Our scores dropped 18 percentage points from 2018. The biggest contributing factors we believe were the teacher turnover, substitutes starting the year in one classroom and having a month of a substitute in another 5th grade classroom. We also found out many of our ESE students were missing science instruction for pull-out services. This has been rectified for the 19-20 school year.

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

As described above, the biggest decline was in 5th grade Science and we have addressed the teacher turnover and pull-out services for the current school year.

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.

All of our averages were well above the state averages. Our biggest gap was in 4th grade ELA with 31 point difference (in the positive). Our 4th grade teachers were working hard with their PLC time and did a wonderful job grouping students and having different teachers instruct using the best strategies for ensuring ALL students master the essential standards.
Our scores closes to the state average was in 5th grade ELA and 5th grade Science. The Science was addressed in the above questions. ELA was also impacted by the significant time classes were being instructed by substitute teachers.

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

Our 4th grade ELA scores had the highest increase from the previous year. The score went from 79% proficient to 89% proficient. The co-hort score also increase 5% points from the previous year. The PLC process made a big impact for all of our ELA scores, but 4th grade really worked hard analyzing data, sharing students for interventions and ensuring the essential standards were taught and re-taught. The teachers worked together to create the common assessments and then came back together to analyze data and create groups for re-teach.

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

We have two subgroups we would like to focus on for this school year. The first are our students with disabilities, they have a proficiency percentage less than our school's average in ELA, math , and science. The other area of concerns is learning gains for our students on free or reduced lunch, as well as their science achievement. Both of these subgroups have data which is less than other subgroups or the overall school.

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

1. 5th grade Science
2. 5th grade ELA
3. Developing single school culture

4. Learning gains for Students with Disabilities
5. Learning gains for students on free and reduce lunch

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Science achievement for 5th grade
Rationale	Scores in Science dropped 18 points from the previous year (2017-18). Durbin has only 70% of the students proficient in science and have had much better results in previous years.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Durbin Creek's 5th grade students will show greater than an 80% proficiency level on the science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers in grades 3-5 will identify essential science standards each quarter and through professional learning communities they will ensure all students have mastered the essential standards in science each quarter. After identifying the essential standard for each quarter they will create a common formative assessment and then share the data to form small groups for both remediation and enrichment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional learning communities have been used in ELA and math in prior years with noticeable improvement where done with fidelity. Two years ago we used the process in math and saw double digit improvement and we focused on ELA this past year with the same results. We are working now on the Science curriculum.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify essential science standards per quarter 2. Create common formative assessments for essential standards 3. Teach and assess the standard using researched base curriculum and resources provided by the school and district. 4. Share the results and best practices for student learning 5. Create groups based on the data for both re-teaching and enrichment.
Person Responsible	Katrina Stanton (katrina.stanton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA and Math learning gains for our bottom quartile students
Rationale	Our students in our bottom quartile are not making a learning gain as often as our general population students. Only 60% of our bottom quartile students in both ela and math made a learning gain for the 2018-19 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	70% or more of Durbin Creek's bottom quartile students will show a learning gain in ela and math for the 2019-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the PLC process teachers will identify essential standards, create common formative assessments, share and analyze the data in order to create groups for remediation and enrichment. Students in the bottom quartile will be "flagged" for extra monitoring and extra interventions will be put in place for students not showing growth after the 2nd iReady diagnostic.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional learning communities have been used in ELA and math in prior years with noticeable improvement where done with fidelity. Two years ago we used the process in math and saw double digit improvement and we focused on ELA this past year with the same results. The focus for this group will be to ensure progress monitoring quarterly on our bottom quartile students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify essential science standards per quarter 2. Create common formative assessments for essential standards 3. Teach and assess the standard using researched base curriculum and resources provided by the school and district. 4. Share the results and best practices for student learning 5. Create groups based on the data for both re-teaching and enrichment.
Person Responsible	Katrina Stanton (katrina.stanton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Durbin Creek will create a positive school culture with respect and dignity for all.
Rationale	The climate and culture of our school is the foundation that makes learning possible. There is a change in student demographics this year at Durbin Creek. We have an increase in Free/Reduced Lunch from 7% in the 2014-15 school year to 18% this year, and minority enrollment has increased by over 10% during the same time period. New students are exhibiting behavior that teachers are not accustomed to dealing with. They aren't equipped with strategies to help with social/emotional behaviors and low academic performance that many of these students bring. Getting to know students can go a long way in finding ways to motivate students and help them understand the lifelong importance of the knowledge and skills they are learning at school.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Durbin Creek will show more positive office referrals at the end of the year versus the number of negative office referrals. The goal will be to have 2 positive for every 1 negative.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	LaVerne Walker (laverne.walker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Project Wisdom, Character Counts, positive office referrals
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Project Wisdom is a scientifically based researched program that includes daily morning messages with highly-rated lesson plans that address current and calendar events as well as pressing issues such as bullying, cheating, and academic performance. They integrate character education and social-emotional learning into all grade levels. A message will be read each morning ending with the phrase,"make it a great day or not, the choice is yours," followed by a student goal from the principal to "be kind and always do your best."

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop key vocabulary and build background knowledge for all students. 2. Promote positive relationships with students, staff and families. (Character Counts!, Project Wisdom) 3. Encourage, recognize, and praise desirable behaviors. (Character Counts!, Honor Roll) 4. Create an environment where all stakeholders feel valued. (PLC)
Person Responsible	LaVerne Walker (laverne.walker@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).