

St. Johns County School District

Creekside High School



2021-22 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Creekside High School

100 KNIGHTS LN, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Steve McCormick

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	5%
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: A (79%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 St. Johns 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Creekside High School

100 KNIGHTS LN, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

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)
High School 9-12	No	4%
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		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns 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.

The mission of Creekside High School is to provide students with an opportunity to achieve academic, athletic, fine arts and extra-curricular excellence, within a safe and secure learning environment. Creekside High school staff and students will strive to model and support the six pillars of character counts. The six pillars of character are Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring and Citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Creekside High School is to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

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
McCormick, Steve	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all campus activities.
Mander, Abbey	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.
Mackoul, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.
Adams, Jill	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is a highly qualified educator who is knowledgeable about curriculum and instruction and is able to increase student learning by fostering instructional excellence throughout the building. The coach will engage in the delivery of professional development, including observing teachers, coaching and modeling instructional and assessment strategies, and providing feedback that ensures effective instruction and student learning.
Bundshuh, Heather	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.
Kasting, Troy	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Steve McCormick

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

115

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,464

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

15

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

20

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	0	0	0	638	565	587	566	2356
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	97	121	108	427
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	46	32	38	164
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	63	54	29	184
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	27	18	25	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	69	64	51	248

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	0	0	0	587	614	565	497	2263
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	36	30	26	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	30	34	22	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	36	19	107
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	36	19	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	12	11	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	12	11	52

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	26	33	19	112

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	587	614	565	497	2263
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	36	30	26	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	30	34	22	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	36	19	107
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	36	19	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	12	11	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	12	11	52

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	26	33	19	112

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				83%	74%	56%	83%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	60%	51%	65%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	50%	42%	59%	52%	44%
Math Achievement				86%	73%	51%	80%	66%	51%
Math Learning Gains				74%	58%	48%	53%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	55%	45%	55%	52%	45%
Science Achievement				93%	86%	68%	90%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				91%	88%	73%	94%	81%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	83%	75%	8%	55%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	83%	74%	9%	53%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	87%	5%	67%	25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	88%	4%	70%	22%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	79%	1%	61%	19%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	81%	7%	57%	31%

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	44	55	45	53	47	38	72	58		96	24
ELL	53	85	80	42	27					100	55
ASN	87	74	45	71	47		95	89		100	96
BLK	80	65	45	65	41		87	83		100	67
HSP	79	75	70	69	44	38	94	82		100	65
MUL	86	80	80	78	60		96	83		100	58
WHT	82	73	63	79	48	45	91	89		99	73
FRL	72	72	42	70	54		88	67		97	54
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	40	46	39	60	61	53	74	71		97	43
ELL					64						
ASN	96	74		94	72		100	95		100	89
BLK	69	58	42	70	63	46	81	82		100	52
HSP	73	62	55	80	69	55	91	84		98	66
MUL	92	69		89	83		89				
WHT	84	66	64	88	75	74	94	92		99	72
FRL	68	52	44	85	83	91	88	91		100	52
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	55	53	46	58	41	24	71	79		92	24
ASN	96	79		96	75		100	95		100	78
BLK	67	43	44	65	26	17	71	100		100	61
HSP	79	62	71	83	44	60	82	88		91	65
MUL	92	67		84	56		100				
WHT	84	66	58	80	55	57	91	94		98	72
FRL	80	62	66	71	47	42	87	94		88	57

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)	

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
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	737
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
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	78
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	70
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	72
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
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	74
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	68
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?

Our ELA, science, and social studies achievement levels have maintained over the past 5 years. However, math achievement, math learning gains, and lowest 25% decreased significantly. Students with disabilities is our subgroup that has not show an upward trend in any data points.

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

Lower quartile math and student with disabilities.

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

Students who were distance learners could of have an impact on our math and SWD data as we were in a pandemic. New actions would be an increase of support for SWD in math.

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

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement.

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

Our reading PLC team as well as tracking data more frequently. We also implemented regular progress monitoring.

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

To continue to growth we have placed all code A and B students in a reading class. We are also screening students who are not showing growth.

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.

Professional development from the district math specialist will be given for CFA's and new math curriculum. PLC training for ESE and content area teachers to work together.

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

We added an ESE teacher as well as ELA and Math tutor.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Description and Rationale: In the 2020-2021 school year our lowest 25% in ELA increased 1% from 62% to 63%.

Measurable Outcome: Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will reach 50% or increase by 2% if above 50%. Our goal is to increase our ELA gains by 2% moving to 65%.

Monitoring:

- PLC teams will collect evidence, identify the areas of strengths and weaknesses among students in the lowest quartile and track students' progression in learning. Data collection will provide rich discourse among PLC teams regarding best instructional practices based on evidence of common summative assessments as revealed from data.
- Utilizing Achieve 3000 data in IR classes with Code B students, PM will occur monthly and shared with the team. The report will provide evidence of performance on the standards taught and where intervention needs to occur to improve instruction and meet the needs of the the lowest quartile.
- Using Achieve 3000 Level-set, teachers will progress monitor growth of Code A/B students through a comparative analysis of the September Level-set to the January Level-set, adjusting instruction as the data indicates

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Adams (jill.adams@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Team collaboration using the PLC model and use of Achieve reading program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teams that operate via the PLC model build lessons that align with essential standard's, review student data and increase student achievement. Achieve 3000 provides additional recourses for teacher to progress monitor.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA teams will collaborate to increase the number of common formative to track student progress. Additional action step ELA teams will review data to determine needs including the use of the ELA tutor. Students in the Lowest quartile not yet reaching proficiency on the FSA will be placed in an intensive reading course.

Person Responsible

Abbey Mander (abbey.mander@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Description and Rationale: In the 2020-2021 school year we had 44% in learning gains for the lowest quartile in math.

Measurable Outcome: Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will reach 60% or increase by 2% if above 60%. Our goal is to increase our learning gains from 44% to 50%.

The effective implementation of the Algebra 1 Consult Model with additional tutoring in Geometry is evidenced through improved summative assessment data and administrative observations.

IXL data will be monitored for both usage and areas of needed improvement.

Monitoring: PLC teams will collect evidence to identify the areas of strengths and weaknesses among students in the lowest quartile and to track students' progression in learning. Data collection will provide rich discourse among PLC teams regarding best instructional practices based on the evidence of common summative assessments as revealed from data through GradeCam and Standards-Based Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Team collaboration using the PLC model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teams that operate using the PLC model, collaborate and align standards and review data which will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Algebra and Geometry teams will collaborate to work with the district on the new common formative assessment and track student progress. Teams will use data from these assessments to share remediation with the new math tutor as well as ESE teachers.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Consult periods have also been added to teachers schedules to help push in or pull out students who are in need of remediation.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Algebra and Geometry teams will use IXL to help reinforce math concepts.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Based on data we would like to see a decrease in ODRs and absenteeism and an increase of our students showing character count pillars.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

We will monitor ODRs and attendance through the deans office and hopefully see a decrease on ODRs and absenteeism by at least 2%.

Monitoring:

We are monitoring this through the guidance and deans PLC meetings when they look at data.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Students are being given coupons from teachers or staff when they recognize a character count trait. On Wednesdays they can come to the character counts cart to pick a piece of candy, soda, etc. Students names then go in a drawing for a larger prize at the end of the month.

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

We have found that students respond in a more positive manner when being able to select items of their choosing and being acknowledge in a quieter fashion.

Action Steps to Implement

Purchasing and providing the items for the candy cart and asking student input for what they would like to see in the candy cart.

**Person
Responsible**

Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our lowest performing as a sub group is students with disabilities. Within that the lowest 25% in math learning gains was a 38%.
Measurable Outcome:	We are going to work towards moving out students with disabilities up 2% to 40% learning gains for the school year.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring data from the district formative assessments. ESE teachers will also attend math PLCs so that they can help support while in class.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Abbey Mander (abbey.mander@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Team collaboration using the PLC process and data reflection after assessments are administered.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teams that operate using the PLC model, collaborate and align standards and review data which will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

We have hired a math tutor to help with pulling students out.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

We have given math teachers a consult period to work with students.

Person Responsible Abbey Mander (abbey.mander@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

We have given time to PLC with the ESE support facilitation teacher.

Person Responsible Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.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.

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.

Creekside High School incorporates many methods to increase positive school culture. The faculty and staff are the core to building positive relationships with students on campus. School athletics, arts and club opportunities are a vital source of the positive culture that exists at Creekside High School. The parents and community are highly involved in various activities that take place in order to make CHS the best that it can be.

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

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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