

Volusia County Schools

# Creekside Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Creekside Middle School

6801 AIRPORT RD, Port Orange, FL 32128

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

### Demographics

**Principal: John Cash E**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Creekside Middle School

6801 AIRPORT RD, Port Orange, FL 32128

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>42%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>24%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Creekside Middle School is committed to providing a safe environment for all students to achieve to the best of their ability. Students, staff, and the community will work together to help every child realize their potential to become responsible citizens and life-long learners

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Creekside Middle School is a creative, compassionate, and supportive learning community dedicated to encouraging one another in a challenging and academically focused, and innovative environment.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cash, John	Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making by promoting the Volusia Proficiency Model. Ensures that educators are implementing the district's Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of the webpage and the VCS Problem Solving/Rtl model (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction. For those students who do not respond positively to interventions beyond core, ensure that the school's Problem Solving Team (PST) is accessed as needed. Ensure adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty. Communicates with parents through school newsletters, relevant meetings, and the sharing of the parent link of the VCS Problem Solving/Rtl website (under Psychological Services) in order to address the purpose of PS/Rtl in meeting student needs and to address frequently asked parental questions. In addition, parents are provided information about PS/Rtl at PST meetings. Teachers meet monthly to discuss concerns of individual students during Student Success Team meetings led by grade level guidance counselors. Interventions are brainstormed and then tracked and reported after several weeks of implementation by the teachers. Teacher support systems include the reading coach, administrators, mentors, behavior specialist, social worker, and school psychologist.</p>
Strother, Jay	Assistant Principal	<p>Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, athletics and 7th grade house leader</p>
Mallory, Steffan	Assistant Principal	<p>Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, athletics and 7th grade house leader</p>
Bryer, Kyle	Assistant Principal	<p>Act as assistant to school principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, athletics and 7th grade house leader</p>
McClary, Brian	Dean	<p>Act as assistant to school assistant principals and principal of Creekside Middle School. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Cash. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, athletics and 7th grade house leader</p>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mongelli, Joanne	Instructional Coach	serves as part of the Leadership Team and be responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Meade, D'Anna	Teacher, K-12	responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes. The chair, or designee, will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities and relay pertinent information back to other members of the SLT
O'Connell, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the science department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Abadia, Edson	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the math department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Raines, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the ELA department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Dougal, Shelley	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the social studies department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Polizzi, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the faculty and staff and the AVID team by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Gibson, Brandy	Teacher, ESE	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the ESE department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity
Shank, Aaron	Teacher, K-12	responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the Electives and PE department by working with and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2012, John Cash E

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

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

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

70

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,241

**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.**

10

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	388	401	422	0	0	0	0	1211
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	90	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	29	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	20	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	77	70	0	0	0	0	192
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	87	82	0	0	0	0	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	22	0	0	0	0	85

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	46	50	0	0	0	0	121

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	77

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	346	366	329	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	44	32	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	49	46	0	0	0	0	139

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	77

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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				65%	51%	54%	67%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	51%	54%	64%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	42%	47%	45%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				74%	54%	58%	70%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains				72%	51%	57%	68%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	42%	51%	53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement				73%	58%	51%	72%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	71%	72%	81%	69%	72%

**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
06	2021					
	2019	66%	50%	16%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	47%	11%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	50%	17%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	29%	40%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	76%	68%	8%	71%	5%
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

6th Grade, 7th Grade, 8th Grade  
 English Language Arts - DIA 1-3, VLT 1-3  
 Science - DIA 1-8  
 Mathematics - DIA 1-5  
 Social Studies - DIA 1-8  
 Algebra 1/Geometry - DIA 1-4

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	572/40	539/46	311/14
	Economically Disadvantaged	264/31	257/40	148/7
	Students With Disabilities	70/16	60/28	39/0
	English Language Learners	44/25	44/41	22/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	597/33	618/15	320/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	293/24	299/11	147/27
	Students With Disabilities	72/8	83/5	38/11
	English Language Learners	43/42	41/15	21/38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	591/31	601/45	298/41
	Economically Disadvantaged	279/24	262/35	118/31
	Students With Disabilities	86/6	74/9	31/13
	English Language Learners	26/12	32/16	10/20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	662/25	382/27	53/34
	Economically Disadvantaged	312/18	164/16	11/27
	Students With Disabilities	81/4	45/2	BI/BI
	English Language Learners	30/17	16/6	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	613/51	589/45	1215/53
	Economically Disadvantaged	290/46	275/37	525/45
	Students With Disabilities	77/12	78/12	145/21
	English Language Learners	28/32	27/19	56/39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	611/50	628/50	321/24
	Economically Disadvantaged	277/42	289/40	146/18
	Students With Disabilities	78/13	80/15	39/5
	English Language Learners	14/36	16/38	8/25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	536/19	289/35	339/23
	Economically Disadvantaged	246/17	84/40	145/15
	Students With Disabilities	68/4	5/0	38/5
	English Language Learners	11/9	4/50	9/22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	588/65	636/45	634/68
	Economically Disadvantaged	262/55	293/37	287/57
	Students With Disabilities	59/20	79/9	74/27
	English Language Learners	12/58	14/29	13/77

**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	16	32	34	22	34	36	18	42			
ELL	47	53	41	53	53	31		50			
ASN	85	74		82	69		82	90	94		
BLK	41	38	44	44	52	46	27	75			
HSP	53	50	18	58	52	44	59	70	63		
MUL	77	61		65	50			69	100		
WHT	64	54	40	68	53	40	64	86	74		
FRL	52	47	31	55	48	39	48	74	66		
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	18	34	32	31	53	43	27	41	62		
ELL	48	59	53	68	70	55					



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	86	65		93	85		100	83	100		
BLK	42	45	39	46	57	39	59	58	60		
HSP	59	55	32	63	64	57	47	61	73		
MUL	69	58		74	81	80	90	77	92		
WHT	66	58	46	76	73	62	73	82	82		
FRL	54	53	42	60	63	50	63	65	74		

  

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	18	37	33	24	47	46	20	48	31		
ELL	8	31	36	36	62						
ASN	90	85		90	80		93	100	93		
BLK	45	55	44	48	55	40	45	70	58		
HSP	54	59	43	57	60	50	60	38	78		
MUL	67	70		68	61		80		80		
WHT	69	64	44	72	69	56	73	83	74		
FRL	55	59	40	58	63	49	62	71	62		

**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	59
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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%	
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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?

Decline in performance in LQ in ELA and Math in addition to our subgroups for SWD and AA.  
Decrease in Science Achievement Level in addition to our subgroups for SWD and AA.  
SWD comprised of large portion of discipline incidents.

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

LQ in ELA and Math in addition to our subgroups for SWD and AA.  
Science Achievement Level in addition to our subgroups for SWD and AA.  
Discipline for SWD and AA

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

Contributing Factors:  
Student Engagement  
Family Issues  
Inconsistent Attendance  
Technology Knowledge of students and instructional platforms

New Actions:  
Teaching at a high level of rigor  
Bell to bell teaching  
More Gradual Release  
UDL  
SEL  
Building Relationships

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

7th grade math improved by 2 points  
Civics improved by 1 point  
Decrease in all other areas according to state assessments

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

Contributing Factors:  
Building Student/Teacher Relationships  
Curriculum Specialists Support  
Learning Walks

New Actions:  
Continuing establishing Student/Teacher Relationships  
Continued Curriculum Specialist Support  
Continuing Learning Walks

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

WIN Time, AVID placement, UDL, Data Chats, specific student placement, PLC's and Stocktake Monthly Meetings, School Wide Academic Competitions and programs, common planning

**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.**

UDL  
Student/Teacher Data Chats  
Further PLC Development  
Stocktake Training  
DOJ Training

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

Weekly non-evaluative walk throughs by administration and DSR

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 63%, ELA Learning Gains were 54% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 38%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our three targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and BLK that performed below 41%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase ELA overall proficiency from 63% to 66%. Increase ELA Learning Gains from 54% to 57% and the Lowest Quartile from 38%-42%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and BLK.

**Monitoring:**

This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal John Cash, Assistant Principals Steffan Mallory, Kyle Bryer and Jay Strother, ELA Department Chair Barbara Raines and Coach Joanne Mongelli

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who:

- have appropriately high expectations.
- share their notions of success criteria with their students.
- ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment.
- ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and
- provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

**Person Responsible**

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

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

**Person Responsible**

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

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

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

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

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

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 66%, Math Learning Gains were 53% and the Math Lowest Quartile performed at 41%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our three targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and BLK that performed below 41%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Math overall proficiency from 66% to 70%. Increase Math Learning Gains from 53% to 60% and the Math Lowest Quartile from 41%-45%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and BLK.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific Math look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal John Cash, Assistant Principals Steffan Mallory, Kyle Bryer and Jay Strother, Math Department Chair Edson Abadia and Coach Joanne Mongelli

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students’ learning and determining next steps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who:

- have appropriately high expectations.
- share their notions of success criteria with their students.
- ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment.
- ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and
- provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

**Person Responsible** John Cash (jecash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

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

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

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

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)



**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Proficiency for SWD was 54%
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase Science achievement for Students with Disabilities from 48% to 50%
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific science look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal John Cash, Assistant Principals Steffan Mallory, Kyle Bryer and Jay Strother, Science Department Chair Kim O’Connell and Coach Joanne Mongelli
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jay Strother (jbstroth@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and Interventions for students with learning needs. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students’ learning and determining next steps.</p> <p>Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have appropriately high expectations.</li> <li>• share their notions of success criteria with their students.</li> <li>• ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment.</li> <li>• ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and</li> <li>• provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of 0.77 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when interventions for students with learning needs is implemented with fidelity. Examples for effective interventions for students with learning disabilities: break learning into small steps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• administer probes.</li> <li>• supply regular, quality feedback.</li> <li>• use diagrams, graphics, and pictures to augment what they say in words.</li> <li>• provide ample independent, well-designed intensive practice.</li> <li>• model instructional practices that they want students to follow.</li> <li>• provide prompts of strategies to use; and</li> <li>• engage students in process type questions like “How is the strategy working? Where else might you apply it?”</li> </ul>

### Action Steps to Implement

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

**Person Responsible** John Cash (jecash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Early in the school year a professional development based on Universal Design for Learning will be provided to all faculty members

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

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

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

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

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

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Proficiency for Black/African American at 27% which were below the district and state average.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Science achievement for Black/African American students from 27% to 42%

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific science look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal John Cash, Assistant Principals Steffan Mallory, Kyle Bryer and Jay Strother, Science Department Chair Kim O’Connell and Coach Joanne Mongelli

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and Interventions for students with learning needs. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students’ learning and determining next steps.

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who:

- have appropriately high expectations.
- share their notions of success criteria with their students.
- ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment.
- ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and
- provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of 0.77 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when interventions for students with learning needs is implemented with fidelity. Examples for effective interventions for students with learning disabilities: break learning into small steps.

- administer probes.
- supply regular, quality feedback.
- use diagrams, graphics, and pictures to augment what they say in words.
- provide ample independent, well-designed intensive practice.
- model instructional practices that they want students to follow.
- provide prompts of strategies to use; and
- engage students in process type questions like “How is the strategy working? Where else might you apply it?”

### Action Steps to Implement

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

**Person Responsible** John Cash (jecash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Early in the school year a professional development based on Universal Design for Learning will be provided to all faculty members

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

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

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

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

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

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Mongelli (jtmongel@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.

**After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified vaping as an area of concern. It is ranked as very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:**

**School will:**

- teach students information in reference to tobacco and vaping and the effects on young adolescents.
- Social Emotional Training
- Community Service opportunities offered through administration

**Teachers will:**

- PASS teacher will conduct restorative circle
- PASS teacher will have identified student(s) complete tobacco awareness and prevention course
- monitor students closely who are habitual vapors

**Data chats will take place quarterly among administration and PASS during meetings to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the data.**

#### **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.**

Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drives individuals, at any level and in any profession. In our school setting, it is critically important that we celebrate and recognize the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and out of our buildings. Here are some of the main contributors to creating, building, or sustaining a positive school culture at Creekside Middle School.

- Build Relationships
- Shared Vision of all Stakeholders
- Being a Role Model
- Celebrate the Victories

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

Creating a positive culture in a school requires that all administrative leaders not limited to just the principal, assistant principals but to the school leadership team to provide access to the necessary resources for successful teaching strategies and resources that are available to create success. Instructional resources influence how teachers present their lessons, the scope of instruction, and how teachers evaluate learning. School leaders who engage in professional development express that they are better able to handle complex change and experience greater confidence in instructional leadership. By utilizing a few simple principals, culture in the school setting can increase.

These principals encourage the following behaviors in our school:

1. More collaboration between teachers
2. More feedback from parents in the community
3. Greater focus on goals for learning the curriculum
4. Higher standards of teaching

Parents, students, and staff should understand their leader's vision for their school, in order to understand and believe in that vision. A culture of transparency and openness helps parents, students and staff to support their school leaders and the goals that are set upon them each school year. Leaders can create this transparency by communicating their goals and beliefs by such means as social media and leadership meetings with parents, faculty and students while creating a voice for each of these stakeholders.