**Leon County Schools** 

# **Swift Creek Middle School**



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Dumana and Outline of the OID  | 4  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Swift Creek Middle School**

2100 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

https://www.leonschools.net/swiftcreek

# **Demographics**

Principal: Jason Koerner

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

| 2019-20 Status  |   |
|---|---|
| (per MSID File)   | Active  |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | No  |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 33%   |
| 2021-22 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   | 2021-22: B (61%)<br>2018-19: A (62%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |
| SI Region   | Northwest   |
| Regional Executive Director   | Rachel Heide  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |
| Year  |   |
| Support Tier  |   |
| ESSA Status   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, click here.  |

## **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

## **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       | 14 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Swift Creek Middle School**

2100 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

https://www.leonschools.net/swiftcreek

# **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvan | Properties that the second sec |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|--|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8               | nool     | No                     |            | 33%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   |          | Charter School         | (Reporte   | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)  |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |            | 49%  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                        |            |  |
| Year                            | 2021-22  | 2020-21                | 2019-20    | 2018-19  |
| Grade                           | В        |                        | А          | А  |

# **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

# **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 Swift Creek Middle School is to provide each student a diverse education in a safe, supportive environment that promotes self-awareness, creativity, motivation, and a love of learning. The SCMS team joins our parents and community in helping students develop life-long skills to become productive members of society who will succeed and contribute positively to our global community.

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

Swift Creek Middle School exists to serve the whole-child through programs that account for the academic, physical, social, and emotional needs of all students. The staff at SCMS is committed to creating and fostering a structured, trusting, and caring environment that engages students to actively contribute to their educational growth.

# School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Koerner, Jason     | Principal           |                                 |
| Wetherington, Ron  | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Austin, Tina       | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Stephens, Dea      | Dean                |                                 |
| Simpkins, Caroline | Instructional Coach |                                 |

### **Demographic Information**

# Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Jason Koerner

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

780

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

**Demographic Data** 

# **Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | le Le | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-------------|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7     | 8           | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228  | 261   | 243         | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 732   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39   | 53    | 77          | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 169   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19   | 20    | 16          | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3    | 4     | 9           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3    | 6     | 4           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45   | 58    | 62          | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 165   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55   | 51    | 41          | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 147   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45   | 49    | 59          | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 153   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32   | 33   | 26  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

# Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 266 | 240 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 727   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 56  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 150   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 39  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 8   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 3   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44  | 39  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 55  | 51  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 171   |
| 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20   | 29   | 18  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 67    |

# The number of students identified as retainees:

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

# The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 266 | 240 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 727   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 56  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 150   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 39  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 8   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 3   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44  | 39  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 55  | 51  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 171   |
| 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 |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|-------|
|                                      |   | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 29 | 18 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 67    |

# The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | eve |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1   | 5    | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times |   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1   | 4    | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |

# 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      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 57%    | 53%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 65%    | 55%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 53%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 53%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 32%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 42%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 63%    | 34%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 69%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 69%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 37%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 59%    | 55%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 63%    | 49%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 81%    | 61%      | 58%   | ·      |          |       | 85%    | 75%      | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 65%    | 54%      | 11%                               | 54%   | 11%                            |
| Cohort Cor | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 58%    | 56%      | 2%                                | 52%   | 6%                             |
| Cohort Cor | nparison          | -65%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 80         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 65%    | 59%      | 6%                                | 56%   | 9%                             |
| Cohort Cor | nparison          | -58%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|           |          |             | MATH |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|-------------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | Year School |      | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06        | 2022     |             |      |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 63%         | 53%  | 10%                               | 55%   | 8%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison |             |      |                                   |       |                                |
| 07        | 2022     |             |      |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 62%         | 60%  | 2%                                | 54%   | 8%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -63%        |      |                                   | •     |                                |
| 08        | 2022     |             |      |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 46%         | 45%  | 1%                                | 46%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -62%        |      |                                   |       |                                |

|           |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 58%    | 44%      | 14%                               | 48%   | 10%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 70%      | 30%                         | 67%   | 33%                      |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 83%    | 75%      | 8%                          | 71%   | 12%                      |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |

|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 98%    | 69%      | 29%                         | 61%   | 37%                      |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 97%    | 67%      | 30%                         | 57%   | 40%                      |

# Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 24          | 27        | 20                | 28           | 53         | 47                 | 18          | 38         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 33          | 35        |                   | 65           | 71         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 72          | 60        |                   | 87           | 83         |                    |             | 100        | 95           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 42          | 46        | 35                | 44           | 67         | 60                 | 42          | 66         | 75           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 54          | 43        | 21                | 62           | 67         | 56                 | 48          | 82         | 60           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 71          | 60        |                   | 74           | 77         |                    | 73          | 89         | 84           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 64          | 57        | 32                | 71           | 69         | 54                 | 68          | 84         | 81           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 40          | 43        | 29                | 46           | 64         | 61                 | 39          | 63         | 62           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 27          | 38        | 26                | 23           | 42         | 31                 | 32          | 54         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 40          | 67        | 60                | 50           | 55         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 82          | 74        |                   | 87           | 59         |                    | 74          | 100        | 96           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 46          | 44        | 30                | 35           | 33         | 32                 | 43          | 62         | 71           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 63          | 59        | 45                | 55           | 42         | 37                 | 58          | 73         | 83           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 69          | 63        |                   | 61           | 47         | 55                 | 44          | 92         | 93           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 65          | 55        | 39                | 65           | 49         | 37                 | 70          | 87         | 85           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 43          | 43        | 33                | 37           | 37         | 40                 | 39          | 68         | 73           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 31          | 41        | 38                | 33           | 38         | 26                 | 30          | 53         | 50           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 40          | 82        |                   | 70           | 64         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 83          | 71        |                   | 93           | 71         |                    | 80          | 92         | 100          |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 48        | 40                | 46           | 48         | 32                 | 38          | 77         | 69           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 63          | 57        | 60                | 66           | 60         | 50                 | 45          | 71         |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 68          | 63        |                   | 76           | 66         |                    | 70          | 90         |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 72          | 58        | 54                | 79           | 60         | 42                 | 73          | 94         | 77           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 47          | 49        | 48                | 49           | 49         | 34                 | 43          | 71         | 65           |                         |                           |

# **ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.                     |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 61   |
| 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 |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 553  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9    |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 32   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 51   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 83   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0    |
| Black/African American Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 53   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0    |

| Hispanic Students  |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 55  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students   |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 75  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Students   |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 64  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

### **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?

Swift Creek students traditionally score at or above the district and state averages in all categories. Based on the 2022 data, Swift Creek showed the greatest increase in Math scores- Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Learning Gains- compared to the 2019 and 2020 data. Swift Creek showed less growth, or a decline, in ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Learning gains compared to the 2019 and 2020 data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

There is a need for overall improvement in student understanding of ELA concepts and standards based on the Achievement Level, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Learning gains from the 2022 data. Further analysis shows a decline in ELA scores in the following subgroups- Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Free/ Reduced Lunch. The subgroups with the most significant decline between 2021 and 2022 include English Language Learners (-7), Asian (-10), and Hispanic (-9).

# 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 across the state have shown decreases in their Reading and Comprehension levels, which can be attributed to a break in instruction in these areas over the last three years. A dedicated Reading Interventionist/Coach, who can review data, communicate with teachers, and develop and implement individual intervention plans with students will help target missing skills and build student understanding.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2022 data, Swift Creek showed the greatest increase in Math scores- Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Learning Gains- compared to the 2019 and 2020 data. This includes an improvement in all subcategories (Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, Multiracial, and Free/ Reduced Lunch).

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

A dedicated Math Interventionist was allocated to the school staffing. This position allowed for a more detailed review of data, shared common practices, and classroom support in an inclusion type model.

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

The Math Interventionist position will continue during the 2022-2023 school year. In addition, a paraprofessional has been designated to work with the Math Interventionist to increase the scope of 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.

In ELA, teachers will receive collaborative planning days to be trained by our Reading Interventionist on Hardman techniques to improve reading proficiency. A dedicated paraprofessional will work with the Reading Interventionist and help teachers implement strategies to increase student proficiency. Teachers will also review BEST standards and develop implementation plans on collaborative planning days throughout the year.

In Math, teachers will receive collaborative planning days to review BEST standards and develop implementation plans. A dedicated paraprofessional will work with the Math Interventionist and help teachers implement strategies to increase student proficiency.

Science and Social Studies teachers will also utilize collaborative planning days to develop research-based teaching strategies that will help implement their standards into the classroom.

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

A Reading and Math interventionist, with allocated paraprofessionals, will continue to work with students identified by their progress monitoring as needing additional support. ESE inclusion teachers, with

allocated paraprofessionals, will continue to work with Students with Disabilities and limit the disruption to their daily instruction as they receive additional support in areas determined by progress monitoring. Additional tutoring opportunities will be provided to students who have been identified based on their classroom grades to improve their standing in class and understanding of key concepts and standards.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

.

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

BEST standard implementation begins in both English and Math this school year. Teachers must review the standards, modify their lessons, and develop new instructional practices to meet the requirements of these new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At least 60% of students will score proficient, 3 or above, on Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA progress monitoring 3 in May 2023.

**Monitoring:** 

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Students will participate in FAST progress monitoring in August, December, and May of the 2022-2023 school year. Data will be reviewed, and appropriate adjustments will be made to instruction and resources allocated to support student success.

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Collaborative planning days will be utilized to provide teachers an opportunity to review the new BEST standards and determine common practices for implementation.

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. All students will focus on strategy-focused instruction, where students receive step-by-step approaches to cope with comprehension difficulties, decoding, and writing. These strategies include summarizing, questioning, identifying the main idea, and using graphic organizers. An intensive approach will be utilized for students who score in the lowest 25th percentile of reading. These students will focus on comprehension, vocabulary, and other objectives, but they are distinctively focused on identifying and remediating serious gaps in students' prior learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Over the past three school years, students have received varied levels of reading instruction and support. As students enter middle school, their needs and areas of weakness vary greatly.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students that need additional reading support (Reading scores, grades, etc) and the areas of weakness. This includes, but is not limited to, students in the lowest 25th percentile of reading.

Person Responsible

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Develop strategies to support students, based on their needs. Communicate these strategies with families and implement the strategies throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** 

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Monitor and review student progress monitoring data to make necessary adjustments to student interventions.

**Person Responsible** 

Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

# #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

BEST standard implementation begins in both English and Math this school year. Teachers must review the standards, modify their lessons, and develop new instructional practices to meet the requirements of these new standards.

#### Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At least 65% of students will score proficient, 3 or above, on Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math progress monitoring 3 in May 2023.

## Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students will participate in FAST progress monitoring in August, December, and May of the 2022-2023 school year. Data will be reviewed, and appropriate adjustments will be made to instruction

Caroline Simpkins (simpkinsc@leonschools.net)

and resources allocated to support student success.

Collaborative planning days will be utilized to provide teachers an opportunity to review the new BEST standards and determine common practices for implementation.

A Math interventionist will provide "Push-In" intervention practices with Math teachers once a week, creating smaller intervention groups to those students who need additional support.

Supplemental programs- Algebra Nation, Moby Max, IXL, will be utilized to provide students additional opportunities for practice and instruction in their identified areas of weakness.

With new standards and limited instructional resources, teachers must utilize their shared expertise to develop and implement lessons. Providing students a smaller group setting where instruction can be directed to their area of concern allows for more direct interventions to meet student needs.

# **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students that need Math support (Math scores, grades, etc) and the areas of weakness. This includes, but is not limited to, students in the lowest 25th percentile of Math.

### Person Responsible

Caroline Simpkins (simpkinsc@leonschools.net)

Develop strategies to support students, based on their needs and implement the strategies throughout the school year.

#### Person Responsible

Caroline Simpkins (simpkinsc@leonschools.net)

Monitor and review student progress monitoring data to make necessary adjustments to student interventions.

Person Responsible

Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

Last Modified: 5/4/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 18 of 21

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

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The data for students with disabilities (SWD) fell below the state of Florida threshold of 41% for subgroup scores.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific

measurable
outcome the school
plans to achieve.
This should be a
data based,
objective outcome.

At least 40% of students with disabilities will score proficient, 3 or above, on Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Reading progress monitoring 3 in May 2023.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Students will participate in FAST progress monitoring in August, December, and May of the 2022-2023 school year. Data will be reviewed, and appropriate adjustments will be made to instruction and resources allocated to support student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

In addition to the intensive approach mentioned above, an inclusion "Push-in" model will be utilized for students with disabilities who receive additional reading support. This will occur on a weekly basis, allowing classroom teachers to reduce the size of their intervention groups and provide more specific, targeted intervention. A reading interventionist will target additional students, some with disabilities, and utilize Hardman techniques for reading intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the**The push-in model provides students with disabilities more class time with non-disabled peers, while still providing additional intervention opportunities to develop their areas of weakness. Hardman is a known program to support students with disabilities, particularly those with dyslexia.

## **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students that need additional reading support, as designated by their IEP. Determine which students would benefit from additional pull-out services.

**Person Responsible** Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Schedule students into both a push-in model reading support program and a pull-out small group program, based on their level of need.

**Person Responsible** Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

Monitor and review student progress monitoring data to make necessary adjustments to student interventions.

Person Responsible Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

# **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

# Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Swift Creek meets the needs of students by creating positive relationships both inside and outside of the classroom. Students can participate in a variety of activities through various sports, clubs, and fine arts programs. Each school year, our teachers and staff establish expectations that are clear and consistent. These expectations of routines, rules, and ways of work for students create a safe, positive learning environment for everyone. Swift Creek has a team of teachers and staff that can support students throughout the year. This includes school counselors, social workers, MTSS team members, and dedicated administrators to monitor and maintain a safe, positive environment.

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

Our leadership team helps promote a positive culture by developing and implementing programs and initiatives that align with the goals and standards of other stakeholder groups. They create the opportunity for positive, constructive conversations through Shared Decision Making and leadership meetings. The leadership team also helps create a positive environment for students and staff by working with various school groups- Sunshine, SGA, Athletic Leadership Council, etc., to recognize students, staff, volunteers, and business partners for their support of our school.

The faculty and staff at Swift Creek promote a positive school culture through the structure of their classes, their involvement in extra-curricular activities, and their participation in activities and events outside of their classroom duties. They regularly recognize students, and staff, by nominating them for various school recognitions.

Swift Creek students create a positive culture daily with the various sports, clubs, and activities they participate in.

Our Student Government, partnered with our Athletic Leadership Council, help organize student involvement in athletic and academic competitions, creating a sense of unity and school pride throughout our student body.

Our parents and community/ business partners are also a critically important component to the success of

our school. Swift Creek's PTSO develops, implements, and supports various activities throughout the year to celebrate our students, teachers, and community. In addition, many of our parents volunteer for important events and fundraisers, providing resources to further support our teachers and staff.