

Volusia County Schools

Spruce Creek Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

School Belief Statements

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

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

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

We believe learning is a dynamic lifelong process.

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

We believe in the celebration of our success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richardson, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Campbell, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Hall, Andrea	Principal	
Secord, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Morillo, Ana	Teacher, K-12	
Kearn, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 12/16/2016, Andrea Hall

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	4	8	13	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	25	30	19	25	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	141	129	117	130	159	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	818
Attendance below 90 percent	25	30	19	25	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	54	43	32	41	40	23				
ELL	55	57		58	73						
ASN	85	77		89	77						
BLK	48	50		65	64						
HSP	47	54		53	56	50					
MUL	85			58							
WHT	69	60	47	72	68	48	63				
FRL	58	60	53	63	64	48	50				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	25	33	29	29	47	38	22				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	35	29	20	42	38		31				
HSP	56	39		46	44	30	20				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
MUL	77			77							
WHT	59	55	44	70	57	42	53				
FRL	53	47	33	62	55	34	39				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	61
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Learning gains in the lowest quartile. ELA LQ is 50% and Math LA is 46%. A contributing factor is that the majority of students in the LQ are also students with disabilities.

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

Fourth grade Math i-Ready median percent towards typical growth declined from 46% to 30% for an overall 16% decline. A factor that contributed to the decline was testing standards that were not yet taught. Hispanic ELA achievement declined 9%. A contributing factor is that last year we had an increase in non-English speaking and limited-English speaking Hispanic students.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile was 46%, which was below the state math lowest 25th percentile of 51%. A contributing factor is that the majority of students in the lowest quartile are also students with disabilities.

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

Fourth grade ELA i-Ready median percent increased from 50% to 111% for an overall increase of 61%. This was due to an increase of ELA intervention.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Suspensions.

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

1. Students with disabilities achievement in Math
2. Social emotional learning
3. Math lowest quartile achievement
4. ELA lowest quartile achievement
5. Students with disabilities achievement in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In review of the 19-20 Math i-Ready data, the school overall increased from 48% to 52%. 3rd grade went from 67% to 53% and 4th grade went from 46% to 30%.
---	--

Measureable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcome to achieve schoolwide is to increase Math data from 52% to 60%.
-----------------------------	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---	--

Evidence-based Strategy:	Use i-Ready data and interventions from the Ready Toolbox to differentiate and plan for small group instruction.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to Hattie's research.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master Schedule includes dedicated math intervention in every grade level.

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

2. Teachers will review i-Ready data to determine differentiated instruction.

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

3. Teachers will engage in PLC to monitor and discuss i-Ready data and adjust instruction as appropriate. Teachers will be trained in ongoing professional development including using the iReady Toolbox and data to plan small group instruction.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain relationships, and make responsible decisions.
It was identified as a critical need based from the EWS data that reports 311 total disciplinary referrals with 23 out of school suspensions.

Measureable Outcome: Reduce the number of referrals from 311(3rd quarter) last year to 290 for the 20-21 year(3rd quarter)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement behavioral intervention programs such as Sanford Harmony and PBIS, which will decrease disruptive behaviors and increase positive self-concept.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Behavioral intervention programs have a .62 effect size, decreasing disruptive behaviors has a .34 effect size, and positive self-concept has a .41 effect size. Volusia County School District has provided both Sanford Harmony kits and training for teachers. This year, modules are also available online which pace out the lessons and provide PowerPoints to facilitate teacher usage.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue with the PBIS program school-wide.

Person Responsible Amy Richardson (amricha1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Also, every grade-level will receive Social-Emotional Learning lessons as part of special area rotation. Teachers will implement daily Sanford Harmony lessons. Teachers were trained last year and those new to our school will receive training from our guidance counselors.

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

3. Provide support for teachers and students from the school counselors as needed.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Students with disabilities scored a 38%, falling just shy of the federal guidelines.

Measureable Outcome:

Increase Math lowest quartile proficiency from 46% to 60% and increase ELA lowest quartile proficiency from 50% to 60%.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Teacher-led interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

Teacher-led interventions for students with learning needs, per Hatties effect size, is .77.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue i-Ready intervention. Teachers will be trained during PLC on how to use the iReady toolbox to deliver differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

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

2. Master Schedule designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible

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

3. Monitor i-Ready data and adjust instruction as indicated.

Person Responsible

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

ELA Lowest Quartile Achievement. This area will use the same strategies as students with disabilities.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school addresses building positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by hosting events such as virtual Meet the Teacher and Open House. In past years, we hosted Grandparents Day, Fall Festival, Donuts with Dudes, the holiday show, and a Veterans Day presentation. Due to the present situation, these events will be moved to a virtual setting as needed. The school's Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Team also hosts mentors to work with Tier 2 students(at risk). This will be continued once visitors are allowed on campus. In the meantime, we are considering having virtual mentor meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00