

Volusia County Schools

Spruce Creek High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	27

Spruce Creek High School

801 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

<http://www.sprucecreekhg.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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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	[not available]

* 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
Bradham, Mark	Assistant Principal	Curriculum AP SIP SLT SAC Instructional Leaders-Leader
Sparger, Todd	Principal	Instructional Leader
Adkins, Shantell	Assistant Principal	Ninth Grade AP New Teachers
Canetti, Alan	Assistant Principal	Facilities and School Safety AP Substitutes Afterschool Events Coordinator
Clark, Kevin	Assistant Principal	SWD AP
Porter, Wesley	Assistant Principal	Data AP
Keisha, rentz	Administrative Support	Administrative TOA
Cappiello, Karie	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Director, IB Director
Murray, Samantha	Instructional Media	
Urbanak, Halley	Instructional Coach	PLC Facilitator Reading Placement Coordinator Key Communicator Achieve 3000
Cooney, Anne	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher
Duncan, Shon	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Teacher
Henderson, Susan	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator
Miles, Danyalle	Teacher, ESE	SWD Department Head SWD Teacher

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morris, Vonda	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Teacher
Price, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	English Teacher
Schafer, Nicholas	Guidance Counselor	College and Career Counselor

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

123

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,530

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

12

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

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685	670	588	586	2529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	126	96	133	474
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	1	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	106	48	56	240
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	100	66	77	273
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	127	85	73	411
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	88	47	36	280
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	11	3	9	76

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	0	75	128	76	86	365

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	85	9	19	137
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	33	6	8	57

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634	568	580	562	2344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	41	51	46	64	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	64	45	52	261

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	14	0	1	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	11	22	61

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634	568	580	562	2344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	41	51	46	64	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	64	45	52	261

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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%			67%	52%	56%	66%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%			51%	49%	51%	53%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%			29%	37%	42%	37%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	38%			57%	48%	51%	63%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	26%			50%	49%	48%	57%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%			34%	38%	45%	53%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	82%			82%	76%	68%	78%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	70%			58%	69%	73%	69%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
		-67%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	81%	72%	9%	67%	14%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	63%	-6%	70%	-13%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	54%	-6%	61%	-13%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

District DIA data from the EWS.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	960/48	1045/50	532/39
	Economically Disadvantaged	407/34	452/39	225/26
	Students With Disabilities	78/15	104/23	46/2
	English Language Learners	30/40	36/36	15/27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	528/4	742/9	484/8
	Economically Disadvantaged	276/3	364/5	250/7
	Students With Disabilities	79/3	91/2	74/3
	English Language Learners	17/12	24/13	18/6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	1077/83	722/73	705/82
	Economically Disadvantaged	357/73	234/62	222/70
	Students With Disabilities	27/44	18/44	15/53
	English Language Learners	21/100	14/79	14/93
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	6/0	7/0	3/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/0	7/0	3/0
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	892/46	498/42	968/60
	Economically Disadvantaged	391/36	215/34	417/50
	Students With Disabilities	92/15	48/10	95/31
	English Language Learners	27/22	16/31	36/44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	107/6	218/4	96/2
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/10	92/4	37/0
	Students With Disabilities	5/0	8/0	4/0
	English Language Learners	3/0	10/37	5/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	463/35	369/30	361/44
	Economically Disadvantaged	293/28	230/26	224/37
	Students With Disabilities	121/19	91/11	92/28
	English Language Learners	25/40	19/47	21/57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	333/77	502/69	324/77
	Economically Disadvantaged	131/73	194/68	123/69
	Students With Disabilities	18/33	26/31	14/43
	English Language Learners	6/67	9/78	7/86

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	134/48	130/67	10/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/44	70/63	10/40
	Students With Disabilities	15/20	20/35	3/0
	English Language Learners	7/43	8/50	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46/0	102/5	51/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/0	72/3	38/0
	Students With Disabilities	7/0	15/0	8/0
	English Language Learners	4/0	11/23	6/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	16/6	13/31	11/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/6	13/31	11/36
	Students With Disabilities	6/0	4/0	2/0
	English Language Learners	3/0	2/0	2/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	251/46	441/36	295/49
	Economically Disadvantaged	151/46	262/33	174/47
	Students With Disabilities	60/20	94/15	61/31
	English Language Learners	20/25	32/25	21/19

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	157/56	146/56	1/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/56	85/58	1/0
	Students With Disabilities	29/69	28/79	n/a
	English Language Learners	11/45	10/50	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/0	48/0	23/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/0	43/0	20/0
	Students With Disabilities	10/0	21/0	9/0
	English Language Learners	4/0	6/33	4/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	3/0	2/0	1/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/0	2/0	1/0
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	3/0	2/0	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	27/47	21/62	9/89
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/36	15/53	6/100
	Students With Disabilities	3/0	3/0	N/A
	English Language Learners	4/50	6/67	4/75

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	40	38	20	33	35	54	48		88	8
ELL	35	41	39	35	41	30	73	27		100	50
ASN	87	71		62	52		90	100		100	84
BLK	39	36	20	21	25	27	50	44		91	27
HSP	56	49	52	35	25	29	81	64		96	48

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	59	53	55	16	15		72	79		93	56
WHT	64	54	46	41	25	32	86	72		94	55
FRL	49	49	43	29	30	29	69	65		90	35
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%

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	49
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	81
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	38
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	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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	59
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our achievement levels generally went down across the board with the exception of an increase in US History and an increase in learning gains in ELA overall with a significant increase for our lowest quartile in ELA. Our math scores had the biggest drop. Biology scores maintained a high achievement level above proficiency. The ESSA subgroup data did not change significantly from previous years and still has room for improvement.

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

We have room for improvement across the board, but the biggest need is in Algebra and Geometry. In addition, we need to focus on our students with disabilities in all subject areas. We are also concerned about a slip in our ELA pass rates.

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

An increase in absences and the addition of the learning from home option due to Covid-19 caused struggles in the continuity of instruction. In addition, we had some teacher struggles in Algebra and Geometry that have hopefully been resolved for this upcoming school year. Our learning walks indicated a need for more student centered learning and more emphasis on learning targets and success criteria.

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

Our US History scores had the biggest improvement. Our graduation rate also increased. We had success with our ELA lowest quartile students (increase from 29% proficient to 43% proficient) and an overall increase of 2% in learning gains overall for ELA.

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

We had a new academic coach who worked well with the PLCs and assisted them in focusing on the standards. The PLCs are meeting more regularly. We are collaborating more using Canvas and Microsoft Teams.

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

We need to continue to work to align teaching and assessments with the standards. Increased use of Canvas to assist with remediation and differentiation. We will focus on more student centered learning and build on relationships and knowledge of students to ensure they are on the right path toward graduation.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our academic coach will continue to work with PLCs to better connect the standards to instruction. We will have professional development on how to more effectively reach students with disabilities. We will bring in the county resource teachers to assist PLCs with strengthening lessons and remediation. We will provide training in how to use tech tools to better facilitate differentiation/ remediation and foster more engagement.

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

We will continue to provide common planning for our tested subject areas with academic coach support for PLC meetings. School counselors will meet individually with each student twice a year to ensure they are meeting graduation requirements and are aware of opportunities available. Provide additional support for students to pursue vocational dual enrollment opportunities. Students will be utilizing YOUscience, an interest inventory to help them learn strengths and weaknesses.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our Needs Assessment revealed that our achievement levels decreased across the board, with the exception of US History and our learning gains in ELA. That lead us to a focus on standards-aligned instruction with a special focus on meeting the needs of our students with disabilities and all students in algebra and geometry. 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.

Measureable Outcome:

Our goal is for lowest quartile students, including the subpopulations, to increase in overall achievement in ELA to 45% and in math to 35%. Our overall achievement level goal is to increase to 70% in ELA and 60% in math. We also want to increase our Biology proficiency rate to 83% and our US History proficiency rate to 70%.

Monitoring:

This Area of Focus will be monitored primarily in our PLCs. During PLC, teachers will work together to create common formative assessments in order to assess proficiency in each standard and offering support and remediation through the entire unit. PLCs will also collaborate with Visible Learning as a focus and will post a Learning Target to help ensure students understand the purpose for learning each day. The Curriculum AP and Instructional Coach will monitor that each district assessment is given during the appropriate window and will analyze the data during PLC to help teachers identify standards that may need to be retaught and support them in implementing targeted remediation as needed in order to meet desired proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy for this Area of Focus is based on John Hattie's research on the relationship between visible learning and student achievement. We will focus on teacher clarity, which has an effect size of .75 in Hattie's research. We will work on teachers using learning target and success criteria as a core part of their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Hattie's research shows that teacher clarity has an effect size of .75.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained in the new B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible

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

Teachers will be trained on Teacher Clarity, which will include how and why to post Learning Targets and Success Criteria.

Person Responsible

Halley Urbanak (hjurbanda@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers in tested subject areas will meet weekly in PLCs to ensure standards-aligned instruction, target-ask alignment, and to collaborate and discuss progress.

Person Responsible

Halley Urbanak (hjurbanda@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Our Administrative Team will be observing classrooms frequently throughout the year during Walkthroughs, and Announced/Unannounced Observations as well as discussions about the proper implementation of the Learning Targets in our weekly PLCs. Also we will have feedback from the 2 District Walkthroughs to see how well our teachers are doing Learning Targets.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to our Panorama Education Survey results, 10% of our students feel that not a single one of their teachers would be concerned if they walked into the room upset and another 33% responded that only a few of their teachers would be concerned. Those numbers were comparable to the results for the question about if they came back to school to visit in three years, how many of their teachers would be excited to see them. In addition, only 43% responded that the energy of our school is positive. While these numbers are all more positive than the district trends, we realize there is work to be done in making sure all of our students are connected in positive ways to the adults on our campus.

Measureable Outcome: We will be looking for an increase to 50% of our students responding favorably in all categories in our Panorama Education Survey.

Monitoring: We will administer the Panorama Education Survey three times this year. We will also administer the school climate survey twice. The results of these surveys will be discussed in our Instructional Leaders meetings, Faculty meetings, and PLCs, with the purpose of being more mindful of the impact our daily interactions have with our students and being intentional about making those interactions meaningful and positive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Murray (shmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive relationships are built upon positive interactions with adults on campus. Teachers will focus on building relationships by discussing effective strategies in PLCs with one specific goal of having 5 or more positive interactions with each student in their classes for every 1 negative interaction with that student. We will also challenge every teacher to speak with every student in their class about something not related to class once a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's meta-analysis of education research has found that relationships have a greater effect on academic achievement than other factors like socio-economic status and class size. It is something we can control that can have an impact on students for life. The effect size of school climate is .43 and the effect size of teacher-student relationships is .48, which means positive impacts in both areas have the potential to greatly accelerate student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Our school counselors will meet with each student on their case load twice per year.

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

Our departments will discuss strategies to increase the quality of relationships with students. During PLCs, the Instructional Coach will have teachers participate in activities that will model how to incorporate SEL strategies in their classes throughout the day. They will also discuss strategies to implement the goal of having 5 or more positive interactions with each student in their classes for every 1 negative interaction with that student. We will also challenge every teacher to greet students at the door as they enter class and speak with each student in their class about something not related to class once a week.

Person Responsible Halley Urbanak (hjurbanak@volusia.k12.fl.us)

We will have a professional development book club selection focused on relationships.

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

The Panorama survey will be administered three times in a school year. The results will be discussed at meetings. Staff will collaborate and plan ways to build more positive relationships with students.

Person Responsible rentz Keisha (kmrentz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Panorama Education student survey from the spring showed that only 25% of our students reported being engaged in their classes. Our needs assessment revealed that our achievement levels decreased across the board with the exception of US History and our learning gains in ELA. We believe there is a strong correlation between student engagement and academic achievement.

Measureable Outcome: Our goal is for the Student Engagement results on the Panorama Student Survey to increase to 50%. We would also like our overall achievement levels on state testing to increase to 70% in ELA and 60% in math. Additionally, we want to increase our biology proficiency rate to 83% and our US History proficiency rate to 70%.

Monitoring: To monitor student engagement, the Panorama Student Survey will be administered 3 times over the course of the year to students. The results will be discussed with staff, and students will have the opportunity to give feedback and ideas regarding what would make them feel more engaged during class. This feedback will be shared during PLCs and other meetings so teachers can brainstorm and collaborate on ways they can intentionally plan to implement the student feedback into their lessons in order to increase student engagement. To monitor student achievement, we will administer DIAs in all tested subject areas within the appropriate testing windows as outlined by the district. During PLC, we will monitor pacing in the curriculum maps and analyze DIA data to determine the status of our student achievement goals and identify possible instructional changes that could be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Halley Urbanak (hjurbona@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be focusing on Teacher Clarity to ensure that students understand their purpose for learning, while focusing on planning activities with the intention to increase student engagement. We will work on ensuring that teachers are clear about what students need to learn, and clear in communicating that with students. In most instances, they will post and reference learning target and success criteria. They will plan lessons and activities to be appropriately aligned with the learning target, sequence lessons in a logical manner, give clear explanations, and check for understanding consistently. PLCs will work to collaborate to ensure all students receive similar instruction and are assigned common formative assessments to be used in Gradebook in order to consistently reflect achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This is based on John Hattie's research and optimal effect size as it is related to student achievement and engagement. The effect size of student engagement is .56, which indicates the potential to accelerate student achievement. Students who are more actively engaged during instruction are more likely to experience greater academic achievement and success.

Action Steps to Implement

Each time the results from the Student Engagement portion of the Panorama Student Survey are collected, they will be shared and discussed during meetings. Any student input that was provided on ways to increase engagement will be shared. Teachers will identify strategies and resources they can use to implement these student-generated ideas in their class, as well as collaborate on new ideas and strategies they want to intentionally plan to incorporate into lessons to increase engagement.

Person Responsible: Halley Urbanak (hjurbona@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data from DIAs and district assessments will be discussed in PLC. Teachers will be asked to reflect on the level of engagement in their classes leading up to the assessments. In relation to scores and achievement, teachers will identify instances where there was the potential for more engagement and will plan upcoming lessons and activities to improve engagement based on their self-reflection, student input and test data.

Person Responsible Halley Urbanak (hjurbona@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our primary area of concern related to the discipline data is that we are ranked very high for violent incidents. We would like more information regarding where the data comes from, because overall our school is perceived as safe and the number of fights we report is anecdotally less than other schools. We will investigate how we code issues on our campus to make sure we are not making them seem worse than they are. We will also look at referrals and determine where we can apply more positive behavior management techniques to improve behavior.

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.

Our school fosters a positive school culture and environment in a variety of way, starting with leadership. Dr. Sparger makes it a point to address students by their first name and inquires about an interest or hobby, such as a sport or club. He also greets and addresses each staff member by name every time he sees them. This helps students and staff feel welcome, appreciated, and comfortable at our school. Dr. Sparger serves as an excellent example of simple ways to make connections within our school to build our positive school environment.

Additionally, we have Department Chairs who oversee each of their respective content areas and serve as mentors and advocates for the teachers in their departments. In addition to our weekly PLC meetings, there

are monthly department meetings where these teacher leaders meet to discuss curriculum, resources, and collaborate to find solutions to obstacles or problems teachers may be encountering.

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

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.

School Advisory Council meets 6 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.

We also have faculty who enjoy serving as positive culture facilitators on our campus:

Vonda Morris- Sunshine Club- promoting finding your "Marigold" to increase positive culture and environment on our school campus.

Sandi Dembinski- long serving volunteer- Take Stock in Children and avid student advocate who shares a

positive outlook upon life with everyone she meets on our campus.

Halley Urbanak- Literacy Coach- "Shout Out Program" message board in our common PLC room that encourages our faculty to recognize the positive attributes of other professionals in our school. Halley also has implemented the use of "Mentimeter" to provide a message board to check stakeholders SEL status/ check-in.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00