

St. Johns County School District

Mill Creek Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kenneth Goodwin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/29/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| 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) | 20% |
| 2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 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 2/16/2021.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | No | 11% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 27% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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.

At Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities where life-long learning becomes a passion!

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Goodwin, Kenneth | Principal | |
| Stackhouse, Stacy | Assistant Principal | |
| Brackett, Christy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Keeperman, Debra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Jackson, Andrea | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Jackson, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Chicerelli, Shannon | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Shely, Denise | Instructional Coach | |
| Alaimo, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | 6th Grade |
| Hodges, Lindsay | Teacher, K-12 | 3rd Grade |
| Stadt, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | 2nd Grade |
| Ottosen, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | |
| Arnold, Kristin | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Quinlan, Noreen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Thomas, Cammie | Psychologist | |
| Brown, Kristy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Brocksmith, Kristie | Teacher, K-12 | Provide challenging purposeful lessons |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/29/2020, Kenneth Goodwin

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.*

5

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| 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) | 20% |
| 2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 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 | 143 | 158 | 149 | 153 | 148 | 183 | 163 | 193 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1458 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 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 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/29/2020

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 | 153 | 133 | 151 | 146 | 184 | 144 | 183 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1245 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 153 | 133 | 151 | 146 | 184 | 144 | 183 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1245 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 73% | 84% | 61% | 72% | 84% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 70% | 67% | 59% | 64% | 68% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 61% | 54% | 49% | 70% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 74% | 88% | 62% | 79% | 88% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | 71% | 59% | 69% | 73% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 66% | 52% | 54% | 70% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 73% | 77% | 56% | 78% | 79% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 95% | 78% | 0% | 95% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 78% | -9% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 78% | -9% | 57% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 78% | 77% | 1% | 58% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 74% | 1% | 56% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 76% | 76% | 0% | 56% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 73% | 10% | 55% | 28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 69% | 74% | -5% | 54% | 15% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 75% | 82% | -7% | 62% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 80% | -3% | 62% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 80% | 82% | -2% | 64% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 83% | -4% | 62% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 71% | 80% | -9% | 60% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 79% | -3% | 61% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 61% | 74% | -13% | 55% | 6% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 100% | 80% | 20% | 54% | 46% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 100% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 72% | 73% | -1% | 53% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 73% | 3% | 55% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

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 | 38 | 51 | 43 | 48 | 53 | 38 | 43 | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 88 | | 91 | 81 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 73 | | 68 | 75 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 73 | 40 | 71 | 68 | 58 | 76 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 83 | | 80 | 75 | | 90 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 68 | 58 | 73 | 61 | 46 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 71 | 52 | 66 | 65 | 55 | 70 | | | | |
| 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 | 38 | 50 | 38 | 52 | 54 | 35 | 50 | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | 64 | | 93 | 79 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 70 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 80 | 69 | | 73 | 70 | 58 | 69 | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 66 | 57 | 77 | 72 | 54 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 50 | 43 | 59 | 62 | 50 | 68 | | | | |
| 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 | 37 | 45 | 29 | 46 | 54 | 41 | 43 | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 60 | | 100 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 60 | 50 | 68 | 60 | 54 | 84 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 60 | | 81 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 64 | 49 | 80 | 71 | 54 | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 64 | 54 | 60 | 64 | 53 | 73 | | | | |

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 | 65 |
| 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 | 458 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| 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 | 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 | 70 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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.

Learning gains for students below the 25%, in both math and reading continue to be the lowest performing area. reteach structures and ESE support services in addition to specific interventions that had been put in place were not used with fidelity.

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

The greatest decline was shown in the 6th grade, now 8th grade, math cohort. This area showed a 15% decline. Transitioning to a K - 8 that year and not having the systems well-developed to provide continuous support for reteach opportunities for student and ESE support beyond required minutes.

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.

Performance of students in lowest 25% math showed a gap compared to the state. A lack of content knowledge and specific strategies to address deficiencies continue to be the barrier in increased performance of these students. Prior to 2019, our students in math were showing a positive trend.

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

In addition to our learning gains for all students in the area of ELA showed a 3% increase, the greatest area of improvement was seen students identified as SWD in the lowest 25%. They showed a 5% increase in learning gains. Constantly re-evaluating the interventions used to meet specific student needs ensures student learning continues to show improvement.

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

The learning gains of students below the 25% continue to show a decrease in learning gains.

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

1. Learning gains for lowest 25% in both ELA and Math
2. Work to close the achievement dip in the 6th grade cohort in Math.
3. Building a positive culture and climate that promotes student ownership in their learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Learning gains in Math for students below the 25%, specifically SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

Mill Creek will have a 5% increase in learning gains for students below the 25% in Math, increasing from 48% to 53%. 100% of students identified below the 25% will attain the stretch growth goal measured by iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Ottosen (jacqueline.ottosen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Grade Levels will work as a professional learning community through the High Leverage Team process to identify Essential Standards, determine agreed upon level of rigor of student learning outcomes and develop a "system of response" including a set of intervention strategies/practices that they know have a positive impact on student learning.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Additionally, grade levels will use the Individual Learning Progressions for students in iReady for small group/individualized instruction.

During Data Dialogue meetings, grade levels will identify specific high-yield strategies that have shown the greatest impact on specific learning deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teams will develop opportunities for students to track their own learning needs and to plan their next learning action. This ensures students stay active and present in their own learning.

Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.

Determining and agreeing upon the level of rigor for student learning outcomes ensures fidelity throughout the learning opportunities for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade Levels/Content Area will unpack all standards with the grade level.
2. Grade levels will identify grade level essentials.
3. Working together teams will identify and agree upon the level of rigor and how it will be assessed (method) as a grade level.
4. Teams will determine the instructional timeline and data dialogue date to analyze the data and identify strategies that were most effective during instruction
5. Teams will plan system of response for reteaching with high yield strategies identified during data dialogue meeting.

Person Responsible

Jacqueline Ottosen (jacqueline.ottosen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Learning gains in ELA for students below 25%, specifically SWD

Measurable Outcome:

Mill Creek will have a 5% increase in learning gains for students below the 25% in the area of ELA, increasing from 43% to 48%. 100% of students below the 25% will attain their stretch growth goal measured by iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Grade Levels will work as a professional learning community through the High Leverage Team process to identify Essential Standards, determine agreed upon level of rigor of student learning outcomes and develop a "system of response" including a set of intervention strategies/practices that they know have a positive impact on student learning.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Additionally, grade levels will use the Individual Learning Progressions for students in iReady for small group/individualized instruction.

During Data Dialogue meetings, grade levels will identify specific high-yield strategies that have shown the greatest impact on specific learning deficiencies.

Teams will develop opportunities for students to track their own learning needs and to plan their next learning action. This ensures students stay active and present in their own learning.

Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Determining and agreeing upon the level of rigor for student learning outcomes ensures fidelity throughout the learning opportunities for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade Levels/Content Area will unpack all standards with the grade level.
2. Grade levels will identify grade level essentials.
3. Working together teams will identify and agree upon the level of rigor and how it will be assessed (method) as a grade level
4. Teams will determine the instructional timeline and data dialogue date to analyze the data and identify strategies that were most effective during instruction
5. Teams will plan system of response for reteaching with high yield strategies identified during data dialogue meeting.

Person Responsible

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Building a culture to empower students to pursue a passion for life-long learning.

Measurable Outcome:

MCA will strive to maintain a 95% attendance rate school-wide.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

PBS has shown to have a positive impact on the learning environment using educational and systems change methods (environmental redesign) to enhance quality of life and minimize problem behavior. Developing a culture that is built on strong values and beliefs and teaching all stakeholders how we respect these values, provides ways to recognize, reward, and reinforce what matters most in the learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Building a climate and culture that shows respect, as a whole, for academic performance, character development, and the commitment to student learning are key contributors in increased attendance, improved academic performance and behavior, higher teacher retention rates, and a boost in overall school spirit.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each classroom in K - 5 will recognize student's that show excellence in academics, character development, PRIDE character traits, and perseverance quarterly.
2. Grade levels that maintain a 95% or higher attendance rate will receive the A+ in Attendance banner to showcase
3. Staff attendance at 95% or higher will be recognized at school-wide faculty meetings.
4. Middle School students will have quarterly rallies that recognize and reward students that have met the Gold, Silver, or Blue levels of Renaissance.
5. PRIDE Bucks will be given to students for going above and beyond and recognized on Friday's with a public display on the student's desk.

Person

Responsible Rachel Naylor (rachel.naylor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have identified that the overall content knowledge understanding in the area of math continues to be a barrier in math achievement beyond 4th grade. Providing on-going, job-embedded math support for 4 - 8 grade teachers will identify specified areas of focus and strategies to implement with fidelity. Additionally, we have 14 teachers in grades K - 5 that were selected to be part of the CGI(Cognitively Guided Instruction) math grant through the University of Florida. These teachers have been attending summer led PD as well as job-embedded PD. They are now entering year 2 in the grant. Throughout observation and feedback, teachers and staff will develop student progression plans that align to standards to ensure students are having access to practice areas to close learning gaps, while still having access to grade level learning.

Providing students with small group, flexible groupings, teachers will work together to build common understanding of what the learning looks like and how to assess at the correct level of difficulty.

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.

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a systematic approach to preventing or reducing challenging behaviors, and, eventually, to enhancing quality of life for individuals and support providers. The staff of Mill Creek Academy believe that a positive school atmosphere will result in a more effective and meaningful learning environment. We are committed to providing opportunities for students to learn concepts, practice skills, display good citizenship and experience academic success. Academic success and good self-discipline are keys to being successful throughout life.

We believe that it is important for students to make responsible choices; choices which are the result of teacher input and guidance; and choices which are based on the knowledge of the consequences. We also believe that students demonstrate marked improvement when they are recognized using positive reinforcement for behavior and classroom successes.

As a result, we implemented a framework for our discipline and school-wide expectations based on PBS (Positive Behavioral Supports). PBS emphasizes school-wide systems of support that include proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create a POSITIVE school environment and establish consistency throughout classrooms and in common areas at MCA.

In the past, school-wide discipline focused mainly on reacting to student misbehavior by implementing punishment-based strategies including reprimands, loss of privileges, office referrals, suspensions and expulsions. Research has shown that the implementation of punishment, especially when it is used inconsistently and in the absence of other positive strategies, is ineffective. Introducing, modeling, and reinforcing positive social behavior is an important part of a student's educational experience. Teaching behavioral expectations and acknowledging students for following them is a much more positive approach than waiting for misbehavior to occur before responding. The purpose of school-wide PBS is to establish a climate in which a common-language infiltrates classroom, provides predictability for students, and celebrates appropriate behavior as the norm.

Another important component of PBS is celebrating successes! We make a concerted effort to acknowledge students as they make good choices and showing PRIDE behaviors:

Polite – Be Nice, Respectful, Integrity – trustworthy, Discipline – Owning their actions, Effort – working hard

What does MCA PBS look like and sound like? Mill Creek will utilize a school-wide point system. This is a positive reward system for when students are respecting the values and beliefs at MCA; making good choices, doing the right thing, finishing work, and following our school wide expectations of showing PRIDE – positive, responsible, integrity, disciplined, and best effort. As teachers and staff members see students making good choices, they earn points.

MCA Staffuly will...

Staffuly will teach, model, and practice each of the behavioral expectations throughout the year.

Staffuly will acknowledge student behaviors that meet our PRIDE expectations.

Staffuly will follow the Six Components of the School-wide PBIS philosophy:

Select and define expectations and routines - Expectations and routines need to be OBSERVABLE, ACKNOWLEDGEABLE, and TEACHABLE.

Teach behaviors and routines directly in all settings.

Actively monitor behavior.

Acknowledge appropriate behavior.

Review data to make decisions.

Correct behavioral missteps.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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