

St. Johns County School District

# Mill Creek Academy



## 2018-19 School Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-mce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (As Reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>20%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>21%</p>

## School Grades History

Year Grade	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
	A	A	A	A*

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://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

At Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

The Learning community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities; where learning is the only option!

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Riedl, Amanda	Principal
Stackhouse, Stacy	Assistant Principal
Green, Susan	Teacher, K-12
Shearer, Jessica	Teacher, K-12
Hutchinson, andrea	Teacher, K-12
Rosas, Jessica	Psychologist
Ashley, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Brackett, Christy	Teacher, K-12
Keeperman, Debra	Teacher, K-12
Howell, Alisa	Teacher, ESE
Bergmann, Abby	Instructional Media
Jackson, Andrea	Teacher, K-12
Jackson, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Chicerelli, Shannon	Teacher, K-12
Butler, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12
Shely, Denise	Instructional Coach
Schneider, Susan	Teacher, K-12
Berges, Virginia	Guidance Counselor

#### Duties

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making**

Principal/Assistant Principal: The Principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards. The Leadership team provides a common vision that is communicated through a collaborative culture to build a shared understanding of learning. Through the use of data-based decision-making, evidence is provided that ensures the school-based team is implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum throughout each grade level. High-leverage teams develop instructional plans that identify power standards, identify the agreed upon level or rigor for all student learning outcomes, and build common assessments that inform decisions regarding best instructional practices. The leadership builds schedules that provide teachers with common collaborative time that provide time for teachers to make informed decisions. Through a school-wide universal reteach structure, prevention before intervention becomes the practice. This ensure that differentiation is planned within Tier 1 instruction and provides a daily consistent time where Tier 2 interventions are implemented and monitored with fidelity. The Leadership are visible throughout the day and meet with teams weekly during data dialogue meetings as active participants in the learning process. Action research drives new learning through identified strategies that are agreed upon for specific groups of students. The Leadership Team monitors the learning of students through system wide practices, benchmark assessments, during collaborative meetings and during teacher evaluations.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary/Intermediate and Secondary): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education in co-teaching classrooms to ensure students are supported in accessing the grade level curriculum.

Instructional Coach - Instructional Coach: Develops, leads, and helps implement school core content standards/ and provides assistance in aligning resources; identifies existing literature on best instructional pedagogy and methodologies, assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation;

provides technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

**Early Warning Systems**

**Year 2017-18**

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	16	25	31	35	23	40	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators			0	0	0	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected**

Monday 8/20/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	4	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Year 2016-17 - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	4	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Students in the identified in the lowest 25% in math showed the least amount of learning growth in 2018. Although this group of students is still lower than expected, those students in the lowest 25% in ELA have shown the least amount of growth in past years.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Overall math proficiency showed a 2% decrease in 2018, however, we saw an increase in math learning gains in overall student performance and in students identified in the 25%.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

The area in which we outperformed the state the most is in science. which showed a 23% higher proficiency rate than the state. The area in which we we outperformed the state the

list was Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%, which showed a 5% higher rate than the state average.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Those students identified in the lowest 25% in ELA showed an increase of 12% in 2018. Only 49% of students in this group met their learning gains in 2017 compared to 61% in 2018.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area**

Grade levels revised Common Formative Assessments to develop the agreed upon level of rigor at each grade level and the best instructional strategies in Tier 1 and Tier 2 to meet student needs. Students in the lowest 25% were given additional Tier 2 interventions that were specific to the needs of the students and teachers used differentiated approaches across grade levels during re-teach times to ensure Tier 2 interventions were implemented in a timely manner.

**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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	72%	60%	72%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	62%	57%	64%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	62%	52%	49%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	77%	76%	61%	79%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	72%	65%	58%	69%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	68%	52%	54%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	78%	73%	57%	78%	79%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	85%	77%	0%	95%	75%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	16 (1)	25 (8)	31 (4)	35 (5)	23 (9)	40 (9)	45 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	215 (36)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	10 (11)	20 (16)	16 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	47 (28)

**Grade Level Data**

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



**St. Johns - 0341 - Mill Creek Academy - 2018-19 SIP**  
 Mill Creek Academy

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2018	69%	78%	-9%	57%	12%
	2017	72%	80%	-8%	58%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
	2017	68%	74%	-6%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2018	83%	73%	10%	55%	28%
	2017	75%	75%	0%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
06	2018					
	2017	0%	73%	-73%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2018	77%	80%	-3%	62%	15%
	2017	77%	80%	-3%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	79%	83%	-4%	62%	17%
	2017	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
	2017	82%	80%	2%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018					
	2017	0%	73%	-73%	51%	-51%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

**Subgroup Data**

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
WHT	74	66	57	77	72	54	80				
BLK	70			80							
HSP	80	69		73	70	58	69				
ASN	73	64		93	79						
SWD	38	50	38	52	54	35	50				
FRL	58	50	43	59	62	50	68				

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
WHT	72	64	49	80	71	54	78				
BLK	64			64							
HSP	73	60	50	68	60	54	84				
ASN	89	60		100	90						
MUL	67	60		81	55						
SWD	37	45	29	46	54	41	43				
FRL	58	64	54	60	64	53	73				

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

##### Activity #1

**Title** ELA Learning Gains & Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%

**Rationale** Overall student learning gains continue to show a gap between those students scoring at proficient and those making learning gains. Additionally, there continues to be a gap between the learning gains of students below the 25% and total learning gains.

**Intended Outcome** Overall learning gains for ALL students and the students below the 25% will increase by 3% or more this school year.

**Point Person** Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

##### Action Step

**Description** Grade levels will use the high-leverage team process to identify a differentiation plan to target learning for each group of students in Tier 1 instruction.

**Person Responsible** Denise Shely (denise.shely@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Grade levels will use the data-dialogue process to analyze student learning results from CFA's. Teams will use a planning tool to re-group and identify specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of each group of learners.

**Person Responsible** Denise Shely (denise.shely@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

## Activity #2

**Title** Math Learning Gains & Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%

**Rationale** Math proficiency showed a decrease in 2018, however, learning gains in overall student learning and below the 25% showed an increase.

**Intended Outcome** All areas of math, proficiency, overall learning gains, and learning gains in students below the 25% will show an increase of 3% or more in 2019.

**Point Person** Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

### Action Step

**Description** Grade levels will work vertically to identify the math progression from concrete to abstract on standards that show areas of deficiency with our developing learners.

**Person Responsible** Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Grade levels will use the data-dialogue process to analyze student learning results from CFA's. Teams will use a planning tool to re-group and identify prerequisite skills and specific instructional strategies aligned to meet the needs of each group of learners

**Person Responsible** Denise Shely (denise.shely@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Activity #3**

<b>Title</b>	Mill Creek Academy will create a comprehensive and coordinated process where academic excellence, continuous improvement and citizenship are promoted and recognized.
<b>Rationale</b>	Developing a risk-free middle school environment where students feel safe and build responsibility for solid academic performance, attendance and self-discipline.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Overall attendance for students is 90% or higher. Students are recognized for academic and behavior excellence in character weekly and monthly. Using the Mustang Pride progression plan there will be a decrease in checks received from 1st semester to 2nd semester.
<b>Point Person</b>	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Action Step**

<b>Description</b>	CORE Team will meet weekly to discuss student attendance and plans will be developed for students below 90%. Students that are showing signs of repeated checks will be brought to a problem-solving team to ensure students are equipped with the necessary tools for success in middle school.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

<b>Description</b>	Monitoring weekly attendance and will develop a plan of action for students below 90%. Use a school-wide tracking system to monitor the frequency of checks and reasons.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)