

Volusia County Schools

# Creekside Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 7/1/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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 committed to providing a safe environment for all students to achieve to the best of their ability. Students, staff, and the community will work together to help every child realize their potential to become responsible citizens and life-long learners

#### **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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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/Rtl 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/Rtl website (under Psychological Services) in order to address the purpose of PS/Rtl in meeting student needs and to address frequently asked parental questions. In addition, parents are provided information about PS/Rtl 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	Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, safety and security, New Teacher Orientation and Guidance and 8th grade house leader.
Mallory, Steffan	Assistant Principal	Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, scheduling, data, curriculum, and the 6th grade house leader.
Strother, Jay	Assistant Principal	Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, athletics and 7th grade house leader

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, John Cash E

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*



**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

71

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	346	366	329	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	44	32	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	49	46	0	0	0	0	139

**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	27	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	77

**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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/24/2020

**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	
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	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	25	20	27	0	0	0	0	72

**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	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	

**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	
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	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	25	20	27	0	0	0	0	72

**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	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	

**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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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.

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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
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		
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
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		
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		
<b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
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.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

## 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.**

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile for ELA and Math 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.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline with our African American/Black population declining by 10% in learning gains when compared to the prior testing year in making along with a 7% decrease in overall achievement for SWD in Civics. This is contributed to limited knowledge of how to integrate the depth of standards in instruction strategies for improvement and lack of incorporating instructional strategies to include more technological practices that supports standards-aligned instruction in the classroom.

**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 showed the greatest decline with our African American/Black population declining by 10% in learning gains when compared to the prior testing year in making along with a 7% decrease in overall achievement for SWD in Civics. This is contributed to limited knowledge of how to integrate the depth of standards in instruction strategies for improvement and lack of incorporating instructional strategies to include more technological practices that supports standards-aligned instruction in the classroom.

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

Math Achievement Gains showed the most improvement with 16 percentage point increase when compared to the prior testing year. Restart Tutoring offered to all students needing assistance. Offered math tutoring during our remediation time with instruction provided by students in accelerated math courses. PLC's involving live data of school, district and state assessments where discussed during PLC meetings

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Level 1's on the statewide assessment with our ESSA component for SWD in ELA and Math Discipline data within the ESSA subgroups

**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 with Specific Designed Instruction
4. Professional Learning Communities
5. Collaborative Planning

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and 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 SWD in the areas of ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students and 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 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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase ELA Lowest 25% by at three percentage points from 44% to 47%. (Administration, ELA Teachers and Supporting Exceptional Student Education Teachers)  
Increase Math Lowest 25% percentage from 59% to 65%. (Administration, Math Teachers and Supporting Exceptional Student Education Teachers)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Steffan Mallory (samallor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Intervention for students with learning needs - Implementations that emphasize school-wide teaching strategies to include student leveling and grouping in order to provide a tiered system of instruction. Teacher will focus on implementation method

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Intervention for students with learning needs is a preventive approach that aims to identify struggling students before they fall too far behind their peers. It is important to note that some students struggle with reading due to causes other than learning just disabilities and language barriers. Regardless of the cause, Intervention for students with learning needs will help students to obtain the appropriate instruction necessary to improve their academic progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Data Tracking for Lower Quartile in ELA and Math through weekly PLC's and data chats that will be lead and by department chairs and monitored by members of administration and district leaders.

**Person Responsible**

John Cash (jecash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

LQ student lists in all subject areas will be provided in the first 2 weeks to increase Teacher knowledge

**Person Responsible**

Steffan Mallory (samallor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intensive Reading and/or Math Student Placement for those level 1 and 2 students that are identified in need of intensive instruction

**Person Responsible**

Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide coaching and planning support to instructional teacher providing intensive instruction in order to increase collaboration and engagement among students

**Person Responsible**

Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our referral count for the 2019-2020 school year will be an area of focus. Creekside referral count was 401 total. The breakdown is 257 White students, 100 Black/African American students, 26 Hispanic students, 12 Multi-racial students, 11 Asian students and 1 American Indian student. A further analysis of that data was 236 of those referrals were written on students with disabilities. 47 of the referrals were for transportation concerns and bussing..

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the number of referrals for students with disabilities by 10%.  
(Administration, Math Teachers and Supporting Exceptional Student Education Teachers)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jay Strother (jbstroth@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Restorative Practices - restorative practice approaches can transform student behavior and build healthy school communities within the school environment  
Behavioral intervention programs - PASS will teach students individual skills relation to social emotional learning through a certified teacher based on continuous discipline concerns.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Restorative practices promotes inclusiveness, relationship-building and problem-solving, through such restorative methods as circles for teaching and conflict resolution to conferences that bring victims, offenders and their supporters together to address wrongdoing

**Action Steps to Implement**

Continue to Coach and work with faculty and staff in order to acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.

**Person Responsible** Brian McClary (blmcclar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide materials based on social emotion learning for all faculty and staff throughout the course of the school year based on best practices and additional information provided through the district.

**Person Responsible** Steffan Mallory (samallor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Incorporate our new PASS classroom for students who receive referrals so that the strategies can be learned to change behavior through our school based teacher/specialist that has been trained in social emotional learning

**Person Responsible** Brian McClary (blmcclar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and 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.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase ELA Lowest 25% by three percentage points from 44% to 47%.  
(Administration, ELA Teachers and Supporting Exceptional Student Education Teachers)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Steffan Mallory (samallor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Elaboration and organization - Focus on student learning strategies that emphasizes student meta-cognitive/ self-regulated learning

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Elaboration and organization strategies, such as interpreting, summarizing, making analogies and effective note-taking, help students store new knowledge in their long-term memory by making internal links between things to be learned

**Action Steps to Implement**

Coach instructional teachers to incorporate students to gather, sort and organize information and thoughts in their own writing or other form.

**Person Responsible** Jay Strother (jbstroth@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning provide by academic coach centered around data collect through assessment and progress monitoring student skill

**Person Responsible** Jay Strother (jbstroth@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that teacher collaboration and professional learning communities need to be more teacher directed with intentional student focus. Creekside will accomplish this through common planning and weekly PLC's by department with breakouts within specific content areas. ESE teachers will attend content area meetings based on what curriculum their are supporting.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Creekside Middle School addresses building a positive school culture by celebrating the successes and accomplishments of all. Events such as Cougar of the Month, Faculty and Staff of the Month, Honor Roll and 4.0 each quarter, and a cumulative Honor Roll at the end of 8th grade. WEB (6th grade orientation) is held just before school starts each year to acclimate our new middle schoolers to our campus. This helps our 6th graders adjust and know the policies and procedures...helping to alleviate their anxiety. Counselors communicate with parents and students regularly through informational emails and counselor website. Parent nights and social media updates serve to keep parents informed about options for their child's education. Being informed leads to more opportunities for success.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.