

Volusia County Schools

Spruce Creek Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sprucecreek/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2020-21 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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sprucecreek/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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.

Bobcats strive to EXCEL as a diverse community of critical thinkers, problem solvers and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School Belief Statements

We believe education is the shared responsibility of family, students, staff, and community.

We believe all members of our school family should be treated with dignity and respect.

We believe positive communication among students, parents, teachers, and staff is the key to a successful school.

We believe learning is a dynamic lifelong process.

We believe all individuals have a right to a safe and secure environment where trust, caring, encouragement, and support prevail.

We believe in the celebration of our 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hall, Andrea	Principal	
Campbell, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Richardson, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Weinrich, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Secord, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
White, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Morillo, Ana	Teacher, K-12	
Jandrew, Madison	Teacher, K-12	
Nunez, Daniela	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Shirley	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 12/16/2016, Andrea Hall

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

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

762

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	109	111	134	132	109	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	77	30	23	25	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	2	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	1	3	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	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	4	8	13	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	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	

2020-21 - 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	109	111	134	132	109	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	11	27	32	41	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	1	12	7	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	10	4	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	0	1	3	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	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	58%	52%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	46%	53%	38%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	59%	63%	66%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	56%	62%	56%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	43%	51%	38%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	57%	53%	47%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The monitoring tool(s) use to compile the below data are i-Ready diagnostics and Science assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	129 / 22.48%	135 / 39.26%	139 / 67.63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	90 / 23.33%	96 / 38.54%	96 / 63.54%
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 7.41%	29 / 10.34%	28 / 39.29%
	English Language Learners	7 / 28.57%	7 / 57.14%	7 / 71.43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	124 / 11.29%	128 / 29.69%	139 / 55.40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	87 / 10.34%	90 / 31.11%	97 / 50.52%
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 7.41%	26 / 19.23%	28 / 42.86%
	English Language Learners	7 / 28.57%	7 / 42.86%	9 / 43.67%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	114 / 35.09%	122 / 55.74%	133 / 67.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74 / 25.68%	80 / 50%	86 / 63.95%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 4.55%	23 / 17.39%	24 / 25%
	English Language Learners	13 / 15.38%	14 / 35.71%	15 / 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	112 / 16.07%	120 / 40.83%	122 / 57.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 15.49%	79 / 27.85%	81 / 53.09%
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 9.52%	23 / 13.04%	23 / 26.09%
	English Language Learners	13 / 15.38%	13 / 38.46%	12 / 41.67%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	117 / 52.14%	117 / 70.94%	126 / 76.98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79 / 49.37%	79 / 67.09%	85 / 75.29%
	Students With Disabilities	28 / 10.71%	27 / 37.04%	31 / 35.48%
	English Language Learners	13 / 38.46%	13 / 61.54%	16 / 62.50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	115 / 10.43%	118 / 38.98%	123 / 65.04%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78 / 11.54%	79 / 36.71%	80 / 63.75%
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 7.41%	28 / 10.71%	30 / 30%
	English Language Learners	13 / 7.69%	12 / 33.33%	13 / 69.23%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	101 / 27.72%	112 / 46.43%	118 / 46.61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70 / 18.57%	77 / 37.66%	79 / 39.24%
	Students With Disabilities	32 / 6.25%	33 / 18.18%	35 / 17.14%
	English Language Learners	10 / 20%	11 / 36.36%	14 / 35.71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	103 / 15.53%	112 / 39.29%	117 / 59.83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 8.45%	76 / 30.26%	78 / 51.28%
	Students With Disabilities	32 / 3.13%	32 / 6.25%	34 / 23.53%
	English Language Learners	11 / 0%	12 / 41.67%	14 / 50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	120 / 40.65%	129 / 48.51%	132 / 48.48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73 / 26.32%	82 / 34.88%	81 / 37.04%
	Students With Disabilities	29 / 16.67%	33 / 13.89%	34 / 14.71%
	English Language Learners	5 / 40%	5 / 60%	4 / 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	121 / 28.93%	128 / 52.34%	131 / 60.31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 13.33%	81 / 39.51%	81 / 51.85%
	Students With Disabilities	31 / 6.45%	33 / 24.24%	34 / 26.47%
	English Language Learners	5 / 20%	5 / 40%	5 / 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	479 / 55%	434 / 75%	197 / 77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	280 / 51%	254 / 71%	113 / 69%
	Students With Disabilities	107 / 45%	77 / 72%	33 / 50%
	English Language Learners	24 / 80%	21 / 67%	12 / 50%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	35	38	32	39	41	22	31				
ELL	67			67							
ASN	100			100							
BLK	58			63							
HSP	59	55		50	55		58				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	67	61	38	69	61	21	66				
FRL	57	54	32	61	57	30	53				
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	31	54	43	32	41	40	23				
ELL	55	57		58	73						

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
ASN	85	77		89	77						
BLK	48	50		65	64						
HSP	47	54		53	56	50					
MUL	85			58							
WHT	69	60	47	72	68	48	63				
FRL	58	60	53	63	64	48	50				
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	25	33	29	29	47	38	22				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	35	29	20	42	38		31				
HSP	56	39		46	44	30	20				
MUL	77			77							
WHT	59	55	44	70	57	42	53				
FRL	53	47	33	62	55	34	39				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA and Math LQ trending down. ELA LQ in the 2018-2019 school year 50 to 38 in the 2020-2021 school year. Math LQ in the 2018-2019 school year 46 to 35 in the 2020-2021 school year. SWD subgroup had 5 areas of increased proficiency from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021: ELA Achievement 25-35, ELA LG 33-38, Math Achievement 29-39, Math LG 38-41, and Science Achievement 22-31. African American subgroup had 5 areas of increased proficiency from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021: ELA Achievement 48-58, ELA Learning Gains 50-67, Math Achievement 60-63, Math LG 50-67, and Science Achievement 43-50.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring data, the lowest quartile for Math and ELA showed the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Lack of intervention teacher, new teacher and new to elementary in a VE mild 4/5, and the revolving door between different learning platforms. The actions we will be taking to these factors are title 1, intervention teachers for every grade level, tutoring all grade levels, school-wide starting earlier (October) rather than January, and new teachers mentoring with colleagues and academic coach.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

From 2019-2021, fifth grade Science increased proficiency from 62-64 and ELA LG increased proficiency 61-64.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

For increased proficiency in Science there was after school tutoring, support from the district Science department, and focusing on the FAIR game standards. The new action taken was after school tutoring. For increased proficiency in ELA, teachers utilized the i-Ready toolbox, teacher directed lessons, and targeted/dedicated time for small group, intervention, and enrichment. Students also tracked data and participated in student-led data chats.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Tutoring beginning in October instead of January, Leader in me professional development, new comprehension ELA curriculum, new Math fluency program (Reflex), and Teacher Clarity professional development and implementation.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Leader in me, i-Ready, Benchmark, and teacher clarity professional developments will be given to all staff to support teachers and leaders.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Intervention teachers K-5, Stock Take training, weekly PLCs, and four planning days throughout the year (one each quarter).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

In review of the 18-19 ELA state assessment proficiency, overall, the lowest quartile decreased from 50% - 38%.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The goal is to increased specific measurable outcome from 38% - 55% in the lowest quartile.

Monitoring:

The use i-Ready, formative assessment data, learning walks, ongoing academic coach support, student-led conferences/data binders, Teacher Clarity, and weekly team PLCs.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: Share their notions of success criteria with their students, ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment, and ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained and receive ongoing support in Teacher Clarity.

Person**Responsible**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

A literacy team has been created and will meet on a regular basis to review student data and plan for future instruction.

Person**Responsible**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty, staff, and stakeholders/community members, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person**Responsible**

Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

IN review of the 18-19 Math state assessment proficiency, overall, the lowest quartile decreased from 46% - 35%.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The goal is to increase specific measurable outcome from 35% - 55% for the lowest quartile.

Monitoring:

The use of i-Ready data and interventions from the Ready Toolbox, formative assessment data, learning walks, ongoing academic coach support, student-led conferences/data binders, math fluency program, Teacher Clarity, and weekly team PLCs.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: Share their notions of success criteria with their students, ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment, and ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained and receive ongoing support in Teacher Clarity.

**Person
Responsible**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff, and stakeholders/community members, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

**Person
Responsible**

Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

The use of i-Ready data.

**Person
Responsible**

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In review of the 18-19 ELA state assessment proficiency, overall, the lowest quartile decreased from 47% - 32% and Math 29%-22% (Federal guideline of 41% or higher).
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase ELA LQ proficiency from 32% to 55% and Math LQ proficiency from 22% to 41%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom walk-throughs, data chats with teacher, admin and academic coach, teacher-led interventions, and coaching cycles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-base strategy is Teacher Clarity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: Share their notions of success criteria with their students, have appropriately high expectations, ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment, and ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students.

Action Steps to Implement

Master schedule is designed to meet the needs of the lowest quartile students.

Person Responsible Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Differentiate instruction based on data analysis.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff, and stakeholders/community members, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes ESE and General Education and planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the task.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Spruce Creek Elementary ranked #1,076 out of 1,395 schools in Florida. It was reported that we have 1.3 incidents per 100 students, which is greater than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. We had 490 discipline referrals at the end of last year. Our goal is to reduce that number by 10% (49 referrals) by June of 2022. Actions that will be taken to reduce the referrals are the use of positive referrals, our school-wide behavior system or "drops", and mentoring tier 2 students. This will be monitored by the admin team and the PBIS team.

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.

The school addresses building positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by hosting events such as virtual Meet the Teacher and Open House. In past years, we hosted Grandparents Day, Fall Festival, Donuts with Dudes, the holiday show, and a Veterans Day presentation. Due to the present situation, these events will be moved to a virtual setting as needed. The school's Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Team also hosts mentors to work with Tier 2 students(at risk). The district is promoting a mentoring program called The League of Mentors, which is also being implemented into our school this year.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The stakeholders include teachers, parents, community members, administration, school counselors, business partners and staff. Teachers and staff support social and emotional learning by giving positive referrals to students, reinforcing PBS rewards and incentives, implementing AVID strategies to promote career and college readiness. The two counselors provide social emotional learning by meeting with students and providing guidance lessons. The community members also support career and college readiness and mentor students on campus. Administration reinforces positive behavior with positive referrals. Parents support a positive culture and environment by completing the School Culture Climate Survey, connecting with us on social media, joining PTA and volunteering on campus.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00