

The School District of Lee County

Cypress Lake Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Cypress Lake Middle School

8901 CYPRESS LAKE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33919

<http://cym.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Cypress Lake Middle School

8901 CYPRESS LAKE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33919

<http://cym.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>61%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>50%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

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.

The School District of Lee County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Cypress Lake Middle Schools Mantra: Passion for Success: Academics, Arts, and Life

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Cypress Lake Middle School, we facilitate a safe environment where students have access to tools and opportunities to promote social and academic growth leading to success in the 21st Century.

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
Miller, Matt	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
Miller, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
Stirns, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member are as follows: Classroom Teacher <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculumassessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Vidlund, Christine	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member are as follows: Classroom Teacher <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculumassessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Voyer, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member are as follows: Classroom Teacher <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculumassessments, STAR or

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Williams, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	<p>The roles of each member are as follows: Classroom Teacher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Cook, Michael	Assistant Principal	<p>Principal/Assistant Principal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
Lockard, Betty	School Counselor	<p>Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often MTSS Team facilitators • Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings • Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process • Send parent invites • Complete necessary MTSS forms • Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested
Patel, Suzi	Teacher, K-12	Behavior Specialist
Fiore, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Specialist
Mills, Katie	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Lomnicki, Brett	Teacher, K-12	Teacher-Math

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Matthew Miller

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.*

14

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest

Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	281	286	309	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	23	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	28	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	55	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	43	38	0	0	0	0	132

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	39	35	41	0	0	0	0	115

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	10	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	13	0	0	0	0	51

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	8	11	13	0	0	0	0	32

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	10	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	13	0	0	0	0	51

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	8	11	13	0	0	0	0	32

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	55%	54%	66%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	54%	65%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	44%	47%	51%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	78%	64%	58%	75%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	74%	64%	57%	69%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	51%	43%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	74%	50%	51%	61%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	70%	72%	81%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	64%	52%	12%	54%	10%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
	2018	67%	50%	17%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	74%	57%	17%	56%	18%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	58%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	47%	9%	55%	1%
	2018	47%	41%	6%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	69%	57%	12%	54%	15%
	2018	83%	65%	18%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	81%	60%	21%	46%	35%
	2018	60%	47%	13%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	72%	46%	26%	48%	24%
	2018	64%	48%	16%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	67%	9%	71%	5%
2018	82%	66%	16%	71%	11%
Compare		-6%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%

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	24	48	46	38	55	42	42	43			
ELL	26	48	44	49	60	51	25	40			
ASN	88	44		96	83			100			
BLK	35	49	43	53	62	62	35	66	27		
HSP	58	61	52	70	68	61	59	73	48		
MUL	75	50		80	76						
WHT	74	63	58	86	80	61	86	86	73		
FRL	53	58	53	68	69	62	57	69	49		

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	39	36	29	46	42	28	53			
ELL	23	50	49	37	60	55		30			
ASN	95	80		100	95						
BLK	35	47	47	51	63	47	38	68	62		
HSP	57	59	48	64	66	58	64	79	48		
MUL	62	48		73	48						
WHT	77	65	48	84	77	54	73	89	71		
FRL	51	55	45	62	65	53	59	77	53		

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	15	37	36	24	38	31	16	40			
ELL	9	44	41	29	52	42					
ASN	79	78		100	100						
BLK	27	42	35	42	46	35	16	71	45		
HSP	52	56	49	63	59	33	52	71	76		
MUL	78	70		78	71						
WHT	77	72	66	85	77	55	73	85	81		
FRL	45	51	39	57	55	33	41	68	65		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
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	57
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 lowest performing area was in English Language Arts Learning Gains for the bottom 25%. Our gains were 52% . We hired 3 new ELA teachers for the new 2018-2019 school year. CLMS lost an ELA teacher half way through the year which impacted 7th grade scores.

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

Our greatest decline from the 2018-2019 school year was Civics EOC score. In 2017-2018 we were 85% in 2019-2020 we are 79%. I believe the fact that this 7th grade class struggled more academically compared to the 6th and 8th grade played a factor in the lower score.

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.

CLMS scored equal to or higher than the state in all areas of the FSA. We will be working on the accelerated points. I believe there are two reasons for the low score in accelerated points. 1. CLMS is an ARTS school and most of students take electives in the arts rather than the technology. 2. CLMS only puts levels 4 and 5 in Algebra Honors thereby losing points in the numerator.

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

The data that showed the greatest improvement is in the Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% of the school population. CLMS gained 8 points moving from 54% to 62%. The CLMS math team worked collaboratively together throughout the year. Also during 2nd quarter we moved approximately 100 students in math to insure they were placed in the correct course.

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

Attendance is a concern when analyzing the data as well as the number of students on level 1.

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

1. Increase learning gains in ELA
2. Increase learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA
3. Increase proficiency in ELA
4. Increase Accelerated points

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: CLMS strives for continuous improvement in Learning gains, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups. Our data indicates that this is an area of need.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2020-2021 school year CLMS will increase ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% from 52% to 54% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All students will be double blocked in ELA and monitored through formatives & iReady. All ESE students are in a class with a general education and ESE teacher (co-teacher or support facilitator) Level 1 and 2 readers will have a double block of reading. Fluid scheduling, especially for our lowest ESSA population will occur as data indicates. High yield strategies To assist with data chats, the APC and reading coach pull data for teachers so they can focus on moving forward. We look at individual students in regards to SS points needed to make a learning gain and 3 year trend data. All teachers are required to do 4 Close Reads in their content areas of which 2 are observed by coach. The reading coach will support them as needed. . All teachers have their classes reading silently for 10 minutes during lunch.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups. Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning. Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension. All areas need to be aware of students reading ability and contribute what they can in their content to closing the reading gap. Awareness is the first step. Close Reads in all content areas help to teach the ELA standards. iReady will diagnose gaps and provide individualized learning paths to help increase competency of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative and productive PLCs
2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing and Vocabulary Instruction)
3. New Teachers will be given one full day to observe other teachers using successful strategies.
4. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
5. All teachers will do 4 Close Reads during the year- 2 will be observed by Admin or a Coach
6. Data is presented at PLCs with best practices being shared for progress monitoring and data chats with individual students.
7. Essa students will have their progress monitored by their case manager. Data chats with students will take place as well as supports not already mentioned above. Students will be allowed access to the

Learning Lab for extra support.

8. Use of iReady to close achievement gaps and provide differentiation.

Person Responsible Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a correlation between attendance and academic performance. 10% of CLMS students were chronically absent throughout the year. We had several students who went on Mission trips as well as a few students who stayed home for religious reasons.

Measurable Outcome: CLMS will decrease the % of students chronically absent from 10% to 9% as measured by Castle School Profile early warning systems.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Contacting parent and guardians and encouraging them to improve student attendance. Incentives for perfect attendance- spinning wheel in the cafeteria. Special focus and communication to parents and students in the lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Contacting parents and guardians and encouraging them to improve their students attendance was shown to have a positive effect in the study by National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Communication through through Parent Link/School Messenger.
2. SEnding letters to parents on the 5th, 7th, and 10th absence
3. Incentives through PBIS program will be given to those students with perfect attendance.
4. Have lunch bunch reward for those who improve their attendance.
5. Make school a welcoming and engaging place.

Person Responsible Wendy Fiore (wendygf@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Cypress lake Middle school strives for continuous improvement, especially in our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2020-2021 school year CLMS will increase Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% from 62% to 64% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady will be used to monitor progress and provide differentiation. All math students will be double blocked. High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math literacy) will be used throughout the school. Before and after school tutoring in all Math areas. Homework Haven on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday run by a math teacher. Data chats are had with the math department regarding individual students using Math Data. The APC and reading coach pull data for teachers so they can focus on moving forward. We look at individual students in regards to SS points needed to make a learning gain and 3 year trend data with a laser focus on our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning. Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning. Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension. Teachers need to be aware of how many SS points each student needs to make to get a learning gain. Awareness is key.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative and productive PLC's
2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing and Vocabulary Instruction)
3. New Teachers will be given one full day to observe other teachers using successful strategies.
4. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
5. Data chats are done in PLC.
6. Use of iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation.

Person Responsible Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a correlation between attendance and academic performance. 27 students received one or more Out of School Suspensions during the 2018-2019 school year.

Measurable Outcome: CLMS will decrease the number of OSS from 27 to 24. as measured by the SESIR reported to the District Support Application by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Wendy Fiore (wendygf@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive behavior Support System

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Center for Children and Family Policy Duke University "Comprehensive school-wide changes that address student and school-level characteristics through proactive prevention and the reinforcement of positive behaviors are related to lower suspension rates."

Action Steps to Implement

1. School wide PBIS system in place at CLMS. Student assemblies are twice a year with each grade level going over the expectations at CLMS. These expectations are for the cafe, common areas, classrooms, and all CLMS events.
2. Alternative to Suspension in place - Saturday School and After school detentions.
3. PBIS positive rewards are given through the Panther Card. Positive Panther card has different rewards at different steps. The include but are not limited to - Positive call homes, Treats, Free seat, Panther Patio, Pizza, Ice-cream.
4. PBIS negative consequences are given through the electronic panther card. The negative consequences are progressive in nature. They begin with a warning, a phone call home, lunch detention, pm, referral.
5. Close monitoring and adjustment of strategy for students in the lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible Wendy Fiore (wendygf@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	CLMS strives for continuous improvement and data indicates a need for improvement in this area, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020-2021 school year CLMS will Increase Civics proficiency from 79% to 82% as measured by the Civics EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Cook (michaelrc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math literacy) will be used throughout the school.</p> <p>Graphic Organizers as well as Cooperative learning activities to increase engagement.</p> <p>Homework Haven on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday</p> <p>Use of District Instructional Guides and Resources.</p> <p>Monitoring of progress monitoring data</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning.</p> <p>Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning.</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative and productive PLC's
2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing and Vocabulary Instruction)
3. New Teachers will be given one full day to observe other teachers using successful strategies.
4. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
5. Use of district instructional guides and resources, as well as progress monitoring.
6. Close monitoring of students in our lowest performing ESSA subgroup to adjust strategies as needed.

Person Responsible Michael Cook (michaelrc@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for SWD students at Cypress Lake Middle School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement.

PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

CLMS will maintain the proficiency in all other areas.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00