Spruce Creek High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spruce Creek High School

801 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

http://www.sprucecreekhigh.com/

Demographics

Principal: Todd Sparger J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
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 (58%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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.

Spruce Creek High School provides all students with a challenging, creative curriculum that fosters graduates who are knowledgeable, contributing members of our community and world.

Hawks SOAR with our Student Centered, Opportunity Driven, Academically Engaging and Relevant Curriculum!
How will YOUR story take flight?

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision at Spruce Creek High School is to create a better world through education.

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
Sparger, Todd	Principal	Instructional Leader.
Bradham, Mark	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Assistant Principal
Clark, Kevin	Assistant Principal	ESE Assistant Principal
Porter, Wesley	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal
Mallory, Beverly	Assistant Principal	Ninth Grade Assistant Principal
Canetti, Alan	Assistant Principal	12th Grade Assistant Principal/ Facilities
Murray, Samantha	Instructional Media	Instructional Technology Liaison / Media Specialist/ SAC Chair
Cappiello, Karie	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Director / IB Director
Keisha, rentz	Administrative Support	Problem Solving Team Chair
Adkins, Shantell	Assistant Principal	Facilities

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Todd Sparger J

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
127

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
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 (58%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634	568	580	562	2344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	44	20	31	135
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	51	46	64	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	73	72	67	326
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	51	42	35	239
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	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	0	0	0	100	64	45	52	261

The number of students identified as retainees:

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	0	0	39	14	0	1	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	11	22	61

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	713	658	636	492	2499
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	54	69	66	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	7	6	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	99	91	56	295
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	120	108	65	452

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	73	63	34	224

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	53	52	5	168
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	36	16	18	131

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	713	658	636	492	2499
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	54	69	66	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	7	6	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	99	91	56	295
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	120	108	65	452

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	73	63	34	224

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	53	52	5	168
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	36	16	18	131

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%	52%	56%	65%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	49%	51%	53%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	37%	42%	34%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	57%	48%	51%	63%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	49%	48%	52%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	38%	45%	34%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	76%	68%	81%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	69%	73%	72%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	72%	9%	67%	14%
2018	76%	65%	11%	65%	11%
Compare		5%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	63%	-6%	70%	-13%
2018	67%	63%	4%	68%	-1%
Compare		-10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	54%	-6%	61%	-13%
2018	45%	57%	-12%	62%	-17%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%
2018	69%	55%	14%	56%	13%
Compare		-10%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	29	20	35	43	39	39	27		76	18
ELL	29	45	38	50	60		50	30		60	
ASN	89	59		93	67		95	70		100	81
BLK	33	34	26	31	38	25	55	30		84	37

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	62	56	46	51	51	19	72	37		94	47
MUL	64	46		59	45		94	55		91	30
WHT	70	52	29	60	50	38	85	63		91	61
FRL	51	44	27	48	44	29	72	52		82	33

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	27	20	27	35	22	23	51		76	11
ELL	29	36	29	50							
ASN	89	69	50	88	56		95	80		100	81
BLK	38	39	27	38	46	41	48	51		73	30
HSP	55	56	44	56	58		78	50		84	59
MUL	72	68		65	52		74	67		93	69
WHT	68	53	37	66	58	55	81	73		92	58
FRL	52	47	36	56	56	61	65	62		81	38

2017 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	19	30	22	28	31	20	50	38		53	7
ELL		38		57	46						
ASN	84	67		87	70		94	90		94	86
BLK	33	33	22	33	44	27	54	48		60	18
HSP	64	51	8	57	56	27	77	71		88	62
MUL	67	51	55	63	50		80	80		91	52
WHT	67	54	38	66	51	35	84	74		89	61
FRL	49	42	30	53	48	37	72	61		71	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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	46
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	61
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	
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	58
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	48
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.

Our needs assessment of available data revealed that only 29% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in ELA and 34% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in math. Our social studies achievement has also languished behind the district and state average with only 58% of our students demonstrating proficiency. In addition, when looking at sub-populations on our Federal Percent of Points Earned Index, we identified that our students with disabilities (SWD) and our Black/African American students are not meeting federal requirements in ELA and Math. Many of our lowest quartile students fall into one of these subgroups.

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

Our needs assessment of available data revealed that our data component showing the lowest performance level was in Math with a 19 point drop in performance.
Geometry being the larger drop in performance or 10% while Algebra dropped 3%.
Keeping in mind we are looking at 2019-2019 data due to the pandemic and the impact on testing.

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.

The data component showing the greatest gap from the previous year was in our Social Studies performance with a drop of 15 % points.
Our social studies achievement has languished behind the district and state average with only 58% of our students demonstrating proficiency. This has been a trend for several years.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement (+4%) was our Biology assessment data. Our Biology PLC used common lesson planning to incorporate UDL Strategies, Social Emotional Learning Strategies that were newly added actions to our schools Professional Learning in 2020.

We have also seen an improvement in the achievement level of our English Language Learners. We have new processes in place to support our ELL students.

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

Our two EWS data indicators are first, receiving a level 1 on any State-wide Assessments and second attendance concerns. Our multiple PLCs noticed that when looking at subpopulations on our Federal Percent of Points Earned Index, we identified that our students with disabilities (SWD) and our Black/ African American students are not meeting federal requirements in ELA and math. Many of our lowest quartile students fall into one of these subgroups. A large percentage of these students were in our EWS data analyzed during administrative meetings and all of our assessed content areas.

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

1. Increase proficiency for our lowest quartile students in ELA
2. Increase proficiency of our lowest quartile students in math
3. Increase proficiency of our students in social studies
4. Increased access to remote learning
5. Additional social emotional support for students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our needs assessment revealed that only 29% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in ELA. In addition, when looking at subpopulations on our Federal Percent of Points Earned Index, we identified that our students with disabilities (SWD) and our Black/African American students are not meeting federal requirements in ELA and math. Many of our lowest quartile students fall into one of these subgroups. Our goal is for lowest quartile students, including the subpopulations, to increase in overall achievement in ELA and math to 41%.
Measureable Outcome:	Our school would like to see and increase of at least 6% in our ELA LG for our Black/African American ESSA Subgroup, and an 11% increase in our ELA SWD ESSA Subgroup on FSA ELA State Assessments. Our SLT will be doing ongoing progress monitoring of DIA and VLT data to measure outcomes throughout the year by analyzing teacher data using SchoolCity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will be utilizing Professional Learning Communities specializing in content areas of ELA and Math. We also have additional specialized PLCs call SLAC Groups which focus on areas such as EWS, LPQ, Grad Assurance, SEL and many others. Due to a continued focus on the incorporation of learning strategies and SEL in all of our PLCs we have seen an increasing in our graduation rates.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Having a strong teacher leadership in PLC has been proven to increase student acheivement through collaboration among teachers in planning lessons, aligning the lessons to standards and creation of common assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Remediation of DIAs focusing on Tier 2-3 words and advanced words that have multiple meanings.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will identify ESSA subgroups on their rosters during PLC Meetings using Focus Advanced Reports.

Person Responsible	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will utilitze LINCS to build comprehension with the academic vocabulary- Frayer Model

Person Responsible	Lekita Howard (lrhoward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will focus on designing lesson plans with the mindset of incorporating Webb's Depths of Knowledge collaborating within their PLCs.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Lekita Howard (lrhoward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will develop lessons infused with instructional technology components that can be beneficial to all student population to give multiple formats of comprehension of content.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible Samantha Murray (shmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Research based questioning to explore content from foundational to advanced levels of student understanding.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilizing the MTSS Teachers will evaluate how to create student intervention and remediation strategies to promote student achievement on future assessments.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible Kevin Clark (kdclark@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	#2 Math Proficiency (Algebra 1 & Geometry) Rationale : Math Achievement overall dropped 6% in proficiency to 57%. The Lowest Quartile learning gains dropped 19%. For our ESSA Subgorup population of SWD was 35% proficiency overall and only 39% made learning gains in lowest quartile. The ESSA Subgroup Black population dropped 16% to a 25%
Measureable Outcome:	Our school would like to see our overall math proficiency to increase by at least 5% to obtain 61% proficiency, and increase our math proficiency in our LG of the lowest 25% from 29 to at least 34. We would like to focus on monitoring the DIA and SMT Data to measure our progress towards our desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based instruction to align lesson plans in Algebra 1 & Geometry content area PLCs. With results from common assessment and DIAs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction will provide a structural and cognitive framework from which teachers can plan, monitor and assess student learning, we selected this as the foundation for the evidenced based strategy to employ for our school to improve proficiency in math.

Action Steps to Implement

Hold Algebra 1 & Geometry PLC data chat days to analyze SMT 2 data from previous academic year.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Wesley Porter (whporter@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Invite Secondary Math Coordinator once a month to their weekly PLC Meetings to discuss pacing and teaching and learning strategies to remediate standards identified as not meeting expectations for the standard.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will discuss student preformance on pre & post assessments of standards in their weekly PLC Meetings. (Spiral Reviews).
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration weekly visits to PLC to ensure effectiveness of collaboration and data outcomes.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Todd Sparger (tjsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Invite Algebra 1 teachers to visit "Pineapple" Classrooms to observe teaching strategies

Person Responsible	Samantha Murray (shmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review performance data quarterly with individual Algebra 1 teachers to determine if students are reaching
measurable outcomes set in Area of Focus #2 Math Proficiency.
Evidence/support of implementation: VSET Observations, walk-throughs and District Specialists/ Resource Teachers will provide coaching and planning support to the teachers in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Todd Sparger (tjsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reviewing our performance data, noted that our student performance is directly related to EWS Indicators of attendance, discipline and level 1 on State-wide Assessments which is evident in our lowest performing quartile, and Students with Disabiliities. Our needs assessment of available data revealed that only 29% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in ELA and 34% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in math. Our social studies achievement has also languished behind the district and state average with only 58% of our students demonstrating proficiency. If we can improve attendance and employ SEL strategies in all content areas, our student achievement will improve across all ESSA Subgroups.
Measureable Outcome:	Our school would like to see an decrease of at least 5 % on our school's EWS Report for each grade level. EWS report data will be used to measure this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Bradham (mdbradha@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs will review data from EWS Report to Identify students in need of support and intervention. PLCs have been proven to impact learning according to Hattie and Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"Professional learning communities use frequent formative assessments to adjust instruction. PLC teams use data to identify students that struggle with proficiency, and which team members appear to have the most success teaching particular standards. This transparency allows teacher leaders to address two dispositions found in Hattie's Effect Size List (Killian, 2017), Teacher Estimates of Student Achievement (1.62) and Collective Teacher Efficacy (1.57). Teacher Estimates of Student Achievement refers to how teachers view the abilities of their students. If teachers set high, yet reasonable expectations, their students can rise to the occasion with effective teaching practices. Formative assessment data communicates whether or not our instruction has been effective. If teachers find that instruction has not been impactful, this should lead PLC members to discuss alternative teaching and differentiation strategies. Collective Teacher Efficacy is a disposition that refers to how groups of teachers feel about their collective ability to impact student learning. John Hattie found that strong feelings of group efficacy lead to greater impacts on student learning. Constant data analysis provide teachers with a continuous feedback loop that reinforces teacher efficacy. Teachers will be the most impactful when they feel like their efforts are making a difference in the lives of students. Differentiation is an organic outcome of professional learning communities. George Couros reminds us in The Innovator's Mindset, the premise behind professional learning communities is the idea"

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs will review and analyze data from the EWS Report to identify students in their class so that they can work with these students.

Person Responsible	Todd Sparger (tjsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC will meet to select a method of study (strategy, technique, resource,article or book) and implement the strategies learned from that study to help students with attendance, discipline or State Assessments to improve student achievement.

Person Responsible   Samantha Murray (shmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Advanced Placement and IB students will be identified from the EWS Report to ensure their academic success in those programs.

Person Responsible   Karie Cappiello (klcappie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PST Chair will work with Guidance on scheduling parent conferences for attendance, academic and discipline concerns to encourage and increase student attendance, academic performance and decrease classroom disruption.

Person Responsible   Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Graduation Assurance SLAC Group PLC will review our schools EWS Report and Grad Assurance Report (Project 10) to identify and work with Graduation Assurance TEAM to support students on the EWS Reports.

Person Responsible   Karie Cappiello (klcappie@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.

The end of last school year found us all facing an unexpected global pandemic that forced us into online emergency learning for 4th quarter. The 2020-2021 school year has many additional unknowns. One thing we do know is that we need to keep our students connected and support their mental health needs if we want to be able to reach them academically, no matter what happens. During the school closure our teachers and school counselors saw an increase in students reaching out with anxiety related concerns about academics and the future. There was also an increase in students who disconnected completely from learning. This year, we need to make sure that we put "relationships before rigor, grace before grades, patience before programs, and love before lessons" (Dr. Brad Johnson). If we keep the social emotional needs of our students and our community front and center, we will still be able to increase rigor, hold them accountable for grades, save our programs, and deliver meaningful lessons. We cannot ignore the fact that this year is going to be different no matter how much we want things to be normal.
Action Steps:
1. Professional Development
a. Youth Mental Health First Aid Training
b. Mental Health/SEL Support from SCHS School Counselors
2. The school counseling team will work with the faculty to ensure they have the support they need to help with SEL needs of students.
3. Teachers will work with their PLCs and/or departments to support each other in making connections with students.
4. Teachers will make regular meaningful contact with every virtual student.
5. Students who disengage will be referred to our Creek Connections team that will consist of members of discipline, school counseling, administration, the school social worker, as well as coaches and members of the community as appropriate to locate the student and check on their well-being.
6. We will strengthen and expand current mentoring groups: Teen Zone, Bow Ties, and Pearls

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.

Our school has many programs that involve multiple stakeholder groups that help provide a positive school culture and environment.
Our school has monthly meetings with department chairs to provide a positive culture of collaboration between the many departments throughout our school . The purpose of these meetings is to share

information regarding curriculum and district needs. The department chairs share needs of their department and discussion encourages solutions. The chairs take the information to their teachers at their monthly department meetings. Teachers are encouraged to give input that chairs can use to problem solve student learning needs. Scheduled monthly SLAC meetings support school goals for teacher voice pertaining school decisions. Sharing school decisions is very important for creating a positive and collaborative environment between teacher leaders and having them in turn create a positive environment for growth in their respective departments.

Our school also creates a positive culture and environment by reaching out to community stakeholders to share in our school's success. Our business partner program has an administrator and volunteer coordinator to ensure that we make our community aware of the opportunities to support our campus programs. Our academies include business partnerships with local business including the FORD Partnership for Advanced Studies which supports our Academy of Information and Robotics. We continue to provide an opportunity for local colleges and universities to join our School Advisory Committee to be aware of the opportunities we present for student success at Spruce Creek High School. During the course of the school year, we have Financial Aid Night, invite incoming parents to a registration evening where they and the student meet with a guidance counselor, as well as other events to encourage parent participation. Our school is active in the community parades, Port Orange Family Days, the Christmas Parade and runs and operates a local Jazz Festival that draws participants from around the state.
Parent Advisory Council meets with principal or designee monthly to support school needs.
School Advisory Council meets 8 times per year with the SAC chair preparing the agenda with input from administration and the district to keep the council aware of the academic environment at Spruce Creek High School. All meetings are open to everyone, whether a voting member or not.
International Baccalaureate has quarterly parent meetings to inform the parents of happenings within this program.
Most athletic teams and the performing arts groups have booster associations who hold meetings to keep parents informed.

We have a very involved parent community. We have a school-wide Open House in the fall. In the spring, we have an open house for our academies and our incoming 9th graders. Our parental involvement target is to keep our involvement levels where they are and to continue to inform parents of opportunities to be involved.
We have an abundance of parent and community volunteers who enhance the quality of our programs and our community involvement.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**