Creekside Middle School

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
college and career
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
resources
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
supportive environment
growth
learning

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Creekside Middle School

6801 AIRPORT RD, Port Orange, FL 32128

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cash, John	Principal	
Mallory, Steffan	Assistant Principal	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, master scheduling, facilities, athletics and 8th grade house leader.
Iorio, Greg	Assistant Principal	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.
Blowers, Amy	Assistant Principal	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, safety/security, facilities, and 6th grade house leader.
Langenbach, Abby	Other	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 assistant principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, and athletics.
Foutch, Jennifer	School Counselor	
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.
Polizzi, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the faculty, 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.
Manuel, Michelle	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Creekside School Improvement team includes parents, students, teachers, community members and business partners. School Advisory Council will work in tandem with the School Improvement team to provide input and offer data feedback regarding SIP instructional focus, will may be adjusted as needed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP is regularly monitored and will be revised as needed through the Stocktake Process and instructional and data progress monitoring.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	60	93	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	68	63	143
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	17	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	71	87	210
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	62	80	175
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	56	81	160

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	90	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	29	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	20	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	77	70	192
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	87	82	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	22	85
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	73	73	207

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	90	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	29	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	20	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	77	70	192
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	87	82	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	22	85
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	73	73	207

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	44	49	62	45	50	63		
ELA Learning Gains				51			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			38		
Math Achievement*	67	48	56	67	31	36	66		
Math Learning Gains				60			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			41		
Science Achievement*	67	49	49	71	46	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	67	68	77	49	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	73	62	73	68	43	49	75		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	39	31	40	43	69	76	53		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	590
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	47			
HSP	57			
MUL	71			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	71			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	51			
HSP	57			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			67			67	79	73			39
SWD	21			28			15	46			4	
ELL	48			56			63	61	64		6	39
AMI												
ASN	82			96			94	100	96		5	
BLK	37			40			41	56	60		5	
HSP	55			57			58	69	67		6	33

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	63			60			65	78	87		5	
PAC												
WHT	65			69			69	80	71		5	
FRL	52			56			56	67	67		6	33

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	51	33	67	60	58	71	77	68			43
SWD	17	30	27	22	48	50	31	33				
ELL	42	50	38	60	61	58	27	72				43
AMI												
ASN	75	60		87	58		63	94	95			
BLK	42	59	45	37	59	48	60	57				
HSP	56	59	34	60	61	60	69	69	68			36
MUL	70	37	18	61	62	57	81	69	86			
PAC												
WHT	63	50	32	69	60	59	72	79	66			
FRL	50	47	33	54	57	56	63	66	61			33

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	54	38	66	53	41	63	83	75			53
SWD	16	32	34	22	34	36	18	42				
ELL	47	53	41	53	53	31		50				53
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	64	54	40	68	53	40	64	86	74			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	52	47	31	55	48	39	48	74	66			50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	39%	24%	47%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	42%	19%	47%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	49%	17%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	44%	24%	48%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	37%	17%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	44%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	32%	56%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	39%	57%	48%	48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	66%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students with disabilities demonstrated the lowest performance with 32% demonstrating proficiency based on the Federal Percent of Points Index, falling below the ESSA 41% threshold. Creekside data also reveals declines from the prior year in Math and Science of 3 percentage points each.
ELA shows a decline by 1 percentage point from prior year, however a decline over 4 prior years of 4 percentage points.
Contributing factors were new curriculum and benchmarks, new resources needing to be familiarized, and new staff members needing additional training.

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

Math and Science demonstrated the greatest decline at 3 percentage points. We had one vacancy of certified teachers each in Science and Math. New math curriculum.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Creekside's largest gap was in Science at 67% where the state average was 47 %. This positive trend rsulted from implementing Penda as a remediation/enrichment platform.
Creekside's largest deficit gap was in 8th grade Pre-Algebra 54% and the state average was 55%. This gap resulted from new resource acclimation and refinement of curriculum benchmarks.

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

Civics EOC demonstrated the most growth at 3 percentage points. We had 2 new teachers on the Civics team and 1 veteran teacher. Teaming implementation and PLC collaboration also contributed to improvement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA Level 1's. High suspension rate.

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

Increase in SWD performance, increase in core subject performance for ELA, Science, and Math, including Pre-Algebra.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Creekside will implement PBIS to address EWS students as well as the entire school to promote a positive school culture and environment. By effectively using PBIS, students will understand schoolwide expectations, teachers will have multiple high-quality strategies for classroom management and incentives and interventions. Additionally, PBIS implementation will increase student engagement and teacher efficacy.

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

Creekside will decrease discipline referrals by 5%, 10+ day absences for students and teachers by 5% and increase utilization of the PBIS Rewards incentive by teachers and students.

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

EWS and PBIS data will be reviewed during administrative meetings as well as Stock Take meetings and shared with staff during faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS is an evidence-based program used to meet this positive school culture objective.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a school wide program designed to create a positive environment and intervention options.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Introduction of PBIS to the faculty of Creekside via faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Abby Langenbach (alanders@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: By August 31, 2023.

Teacher enrollment and use of the PBIS application and awarding incentive points. Teachers will be monitored monthly through the PBIS application for participation and student engagement. Additionally, students will access the PBIS store to 'redeem' points for positive behavior and meeting the core values of Creekside Middle School. The store will be offered to students approximately monthly.

Person Responsible: Abby Langenbach (alanders@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: After August 31st, monthly Tier 1 PBIS Team meetings, in addition to data monitoring and bi-weekly store data available.

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SWD performance achievement in ELA and Math will be the area of focus as revealed through state assessment data. There is a deficit in SWD student performance in ELA and Math, with a Federal Index Schore of 32%. With an increase in focus aligned instruction and tasks student proficiency will increase.

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

By May 2024, 41% of SWD students will demonstrate proficiency on ELA and Math Progress Monitoring 3. Tool Additionally, 100% of teachers will be teaching benchmark aligned instruction in Math and ELA. Ultimately, Creekside will meet or exceed the Federal Index proficiency percentage of 41%.

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

Progress monitoring will occur through frequent classroom walk-through observations using an instructional look-for tool as well as student performance on district and state assessments, including VBAs, PMs 1 and 2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Iorio (gmiorio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based interventions Creekside will implement the following four instructional strategies: benchmark aligned instruction, alignment of benchmark to task, student collaboration, and higher-order questioning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These ELA and Math instructional strategies are classroom expectations of thel District and Creekside will implement them with fidelity and intensity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Development with faculty and staff on the four evidence-based strategies (look-fors).

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

By When: By August 14, 2024

School leadership will develop and implement a walk-through tool aligned to the evidence-based practices (look-fors). Using the tool, school leaders will collect data to identify fidelity implementation and providing effective instructional feedback.

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

By When: Completion of this step by May, 2024. This step is an ongoing refinement of instructional practice.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Creekside will vet and monitor that all SIP funds are aligned to ATSI focus. Creekside will use school funding as needed, in collaboration with our school community and district, to obtain resources necessary to improve and support student learning and increase in achievement.