

Volusia County Schools

Cypress Creek Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cypress Creek Elementary School

6100 S WILLIAMSON BLVD, Port Orange, FL 32128

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristina Kania

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
2018-19 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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cypress Creek Elementary School

6100 S WILLIAMSON BLVD, Port Orange, FL 32128

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	35%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	A	B

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 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 Cypress Creek Elementary family will work as a team to encourage student achievement, safety, respect, and citizenship in order to ensure success of each and every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

Cypress Creek cares about the success of every student. Our goal is to set high expectations and provide a quality education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bronson, Adrian	Principal	Instructional Leadership; School Management; Human Resources; Professional Development
Hemings, Susan	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security; Professional Development; discipline; instructional leadership
Bray, Trisha	Teacher, K-12	KG teacher; SAC Chair
Walker, Sofia	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade teacher; SAC Secretary

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	117	131	130	129	141	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	75%	56%	57%	72%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	56%	58%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	46%	53%	42%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	59%	63%	82%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	69%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	65%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	53%	76%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	117 (0)	131 (0)	130 (0)	129 (0)	141 (0)	168 (0)	816 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	0 ()	1 ()	4 ()	3 ()	4 ()	15 (0)
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)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	8 (0)	25 (0)	42 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
	2018	73%	58%	15%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	59%	16%	64%	11%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	56%	15%	53%	18%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	32	32	29	33	29	25				
ELL	44	67	50	59	56						
ASN	75	92		81	83						
BLK	79	75		72	45						
HSP	69	67		60	38		47				
MUL	64	56		68	50						
WHT	76	67	50	71	59	39	75				
FRL	61	60	44	66	54	33	60				

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	23	37	38	26	30	28					
ELL	37	64		53	57						
ASN	86	69		85	73						
BLK	63	36		53	45						
HSP	70	57	55	78	60		86				
MUL	71	70		52	40						
WHT	75	57	43	76	49	38	73				
FRL	65	53	37	67	48	35	73				
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	18	5		38	47	44	8				
ELL	33	58		67	75						
ASN	84	80		100	85		90				
BLK	45	45		60	55						
HSP	59	76		81	76						
MUL	72	82		78	73						
WHT	74	62	40	83	67	64	77				
FRL	53	48	19	67	58	66	56				

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	62
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest quartile displayed the lowest performance, particularly with our SWD. This performance has been a trend at CCE and was further exacerbated during the 2018-2019 school year due to staffing issues. The inability to obtain a full-time teacher in our separate class for SWD hindered student growth. Another factor contributing to the low performance was an entirely new ESE staff with three teachers new to ESE and to the school. Unfamiliarity with students, a changing curriculum, and resources affected their ability to have a positive effect on student performance.

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

Proficiency in mathematics showed the greatest decline with a decrease of 14%, particularly in 5th grade. This decrease has been attributed to the lack of math resources, including textbooks. Math interventions for struggling students also continues to be a contributing factor in student performance.

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.

ELA learning gains had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Overall, ELA learning gains showed an 11% increase. This change is due to an increased focus on standards-aligned, differentiated instruction in small group to target individual student needs. Trainings on small group instruction as well as intervention strategies were provided throughout the 2018-2019 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

25 students currently in grade 5 earned a level 1 on FSA. Of these students, 22 were SWD.

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

1. SWD proficiency in both math and reading
2. Math proficiency overall
- 3.

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Lowest Quartile

Rationale As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it revealed that 36% of our lowest quartile math students demonstrated proficiency which is below the district and state average. The SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students making learning gains and meeting proficiency on the math assessment.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase math lowest quartile proficiency from 36% to 46%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Standards-Aligned Instruction. (Teacher Clarity)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy According to Hattie, teacher clarity has a .75 effect size. Teacher clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that do not promote learning by identifying the critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.

Action Step

Description

1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan
2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and SIP goal.
3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD and LQ.
4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow-up.
5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning.
6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching.
7. Monitor student progress through iReady data, FSA data.

Person Responsible Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	SWD Subgroup
Rationale	23% of SWD demonstrated proficiency in ELA with 37% making learning gains, both of which are below the state and district average. 26% of SWD demonstrated proficiency in math with 30% making learning gains, both of which are below the state and district average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the proficiency of SWD in ELA from 23% to 33%. Increase ELA learning gains for SWD from 37% to 47%. Increase the percentage of SWD demonstrating proficiency in math from 26% to 36%. Increase math learning gains for SWD from 30% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Hattie, providing comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students has a .77 effect size. This includes providing attention to sequencing, drill-repetition-practice, segmenting information into parts or units for later synthesis, controlling task difficulty through prompts and cues, making use of technology, systematically modeling problem solving steps, and making use of small interactive groups.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan 2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and SIP goal. 3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD and LQ. 4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow-up. 5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning (small group instruction). 6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching. 7. Monitor student progress through iReady data, FSA data.
Person Responsible	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it revealed that 75% of our 4th grade students and 58% of our 5th grade students demonstrated proficiency in math which is below the district and state average. These represent a 4% and 14% decrease respectively in proficiency from the 2017-2018 school year. With an average of 71% of all students demonstrating proficiency, the SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students meeting proficiency on the math assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase math proficiency from 71% to 75% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-Aligned Instruction (Teacher Clarity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Hattie, teacher clarity has a .75 effect size. Teacher clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that do not promote learning by identifying the critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan 2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and SIP goal. 3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD and LQ. 4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow-up. 5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning. 6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching. 7. Monitor student progress through iReady data, FSA data.
Person Responsible	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD Subgroup	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00