Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://spc.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Larson

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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 (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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 is pending approval by the Clay 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.](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

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://spc.oneclay.net

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)
Elementary School PK-6	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary is committed to working collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide students with an educational experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower students by providing an innovative and engaging learning environment that prepares them for future success.

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
Rodrigues, Brandy	Assistant Principal	
Ivey, Rodney	Principal	
Norton, Leah	Teacher, K-12	UE Montessori Team lead
Poor, Govinda	Teacher, K-12	Kinder Team lead Community Involvement Coordinator
Ortega, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade team lead
Van De Water, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Ferrante, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	EC Montessori team lead and Student Engagement Coordinator
Sujka, Paul	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade team lead
McCord, Amy	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade team lead
Mitchell, Jordan	Teacher, K-12	1st grade team lead
Finn, Linda	Teacher, K-12	LE Montessori Team lead
Glover, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	6th grade Team lead
Paternoster, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	VE Team lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/11/2020, Cheryl Larson

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.*
3

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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 (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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](#).	

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	72	77	74	72	64	54	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	80	71	71	69	62	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
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 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	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	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
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	80	71	71	69	62	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	16	18	5	12	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	3	0	9	7	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	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	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	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	63%	65%	57%	60%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	62%	58%	67%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	54%	53%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	70%	63%	59%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	66%	62%	58%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	56%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	65%	53%	52%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	68%	-8%	58%	2%
	2018	57%	68%	-11%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	64%	-21%	58%	-15%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	71%	64%	7%	54%	17%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	69%	-12%	64%	-7%
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	65%	64%	1%	60%	5%
	2018	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	52%	70%	-18%	55%	-3%
	2018	56%	68%	-12%	52%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	63%	7%	53%	17%
	2018	68%	64%	4%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	48	63	57	49	59	43	50				
BLK	57	64	30	57	64		70				
HSP	64	72		58	63	55	58				
MUL	65	71		60	71						
WHT	65	67	68	67	61	44	75				
FRL	54	56	57	56	56	48	61				
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	36	38	32	43	42	33	65				
BLK	58	42		54	58		67				
HSP	46	60	50	51	47	40	70				
MUL	69	45		53	20						
WHT	58	52	41	65	63	42	78				
FRL	54	52	43	57	52	34	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	27	58	48	30	45	35	38				
BLK	45	67		55	53						
HSP	52	54		55	54						
MUL	50			36							
WHT	64	72	50	62	57	45	55				
FRL	53	63	54	52	53	52	49				

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	63
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	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	62
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	67
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	64
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	55
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.

During the 18-19 school year, Math lower quartile gains performed the lowest out of all other components. 49% of the students in the lowest quartile achieved gains. A decline in overall proficiency scores in bot 4th an d6th grade contributed to a decline in learning gains for the lowest quartile students. This is not a trend.

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

All areas of school wide data showed increases. the grade level component with the largest decline in 4th grade ELA proficiency. 4th Grade scores declined from 66% proficiency in the 17-18 school year

to 43% proficient in the 18-19 school year. Two contributing factors for this decline was an insufficiency in teacher capacity and a deficit in appropriate curriculum materials.

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.

The grade level component with the largest gap is 4th grade ELA. In the 18-19 school year, 4th grade proficiency was 15% lower that the state average. Two contributing factors for this decline was an insufficiency in teacher capacity and a deficit in appropriate curriculum materials.This is not a trend.

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

During the 18-19 school year overall ELA lowest quartile gains increased 20 points over the prior year.

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

Math performance across all components
ELA progress and performance

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

1. Math LQ and Gains
2. ELA LQ and Gains
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year, student achievement and learning gains decreased 6%. As a school 49% of students that were identified as being in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics is a core subject in which students must show proficiency in order the graduate high school and be college and career ready. If teachers identify and monitor students identified in the lowest quartile for remediation and targeted instruction based on data, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile obtaining goals will increase .
Measurable Outcome:	Students will have FSA Math proficiency of 62%, math gains of 62% and lowest quartile gains of 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase their capacity in mathematics teaching strategies in order to provide high quality lessons that are deeply engaging for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	students who are provided with highly engaging lessons take more ownership in their learning which leads to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will participate in monthly data meetings with administrators.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Teachers will participate in weekly team meetings to plan high quality small group instruction.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Teachers will engage in content area PLC's weekly to collaboratively review teaching strategies and student data to better inform instructional practices.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Administrators and teachers will participate in weekly walkthroughs and feedback cycles.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year, Student achievement and learning gains increased as a school. However, 4th grade ELA achievement decreased significantly. ELA is a core subject that is used across all disciplines
Measurable Outcome:	Students will have FSA ELA proficiency of 62%, math gains of 62% and lowest quartile gains of 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase their capacity in ELA teaching strategies in order to provide high quality lessons that are deeply engaging for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are provided with deeply engaging lessons take more ownership in their learning which leads to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in monthly data meetings with administrators.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Teacher will engage in monthly PLCs weekly to collaboratively review teaching strategies and student data to better inform instruction.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will participate in weekly team meetings to plan high quality small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Administrators and teachers will participate in weekly walkthroughs and feedback cycles.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Monitor additional areas as needed.
Team level meetings to monitor other areas of concern.

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.

SPC does several things to ensure a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by:
Parent and Staff organizations:
SAC
PFA
Mentors and volunteers
Parent involvement activities
Open House
Orientation
Principal's Award lunch
Run Walk
Donuts with Dads
Muffins with Moms
STEAM night
Winter Chorus Concert and Spaghetti Dinner Night
Spring Chorus Concert
End of the year awards
6th Grade Graduation

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.