

The School District of Palm Beach County

Cypress Trails 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Cypress Trails Elementary School

133 PARK RD N, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

<https://ctes.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Bruce Saulter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: B (57%)
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	N/A
* 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 Palm Beach 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Cypress Trails Elementary School

133 PARK RD N, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

<https://ctes.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Cypress Trails 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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Trails envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
Saulter, Bruce	Principal	Overseeing the execution and monitoring of School Improvement strategies and actions
Ventriglio, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Supporting the teacher development of new and veteran teachers through PD's, mentoring, and all aspect of the coaching model SEL Contact to provide mentoring for teachers regarding implementation of SEL strategies
Hall, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in overseeing the execution and monitoring of School Improvement strategies and actions Monitoring PLC's and professional development for implementation of strategies that support the SIP
Egipciano, Karina	School Counselor	Supports students and teachers through SWPBS Services students in need with behavioral and mental health strategies in small groups
Dettling, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Services students with exceptionalities Oversees the School Based Team and the data collection of the RTI process
Robinson, Sharon	Teacher, K-12	Supports struggling students using reading interventions in small groups
Kress, Mikayla	Other	Behavioral and mental health professional Support student with behavioral and/or mental health concerns Mentor teachers with strategies to utilize in the classroom Assist with PBS implementation
Mangual, Arianna	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Contact and K-5 Teacher Support and mentor with ESOL strategies Maintain ELL documentation

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	86	76	77	68	54	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	5	5	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	3	5	4	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	34	19	30	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	4	8	3	17	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

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

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	14	8	10	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	4	3	9	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	27	25	34	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	14	13	0	0	0	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	7	6	10	27	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	14	8	10	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	4	3	9	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	27	25	34	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	14	13	0	0	0	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	7	6	10	27	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	64%	58%	57%	59%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	63%	58%	57%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	56%	53%	56%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	68%	63%	79%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	68%	62%	81%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	59%	51%	78%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	51%	53%	60%	51%	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	86 (0)	76 (0)	77 (0)	68 (0)	54 (0)	89 (0)	450 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (14)	8 (8)	5 (10)	5 (12)	12 (10)	9 (10)	49 (64)
One or more suspensions	3 (4)	5 (3)	4 (9)	7 (11)	11 (2)	3 (1)	33 (30)
Course failure in ELA or Math	16 (14)	34 (27)	19 (25)	30 (34)	24 (17)	28 (22)	151 (139)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (24)	17 (14)	21 (13)	53 (51)

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	55%	54%	1%	58%	-3%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	62%	6%	58%	10%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	56%	13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	63%	59%	4%	56%	7%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	65%	13%	62%	16%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	67%	-3%	64%	0%
	2018	78%	63%	15%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	74%	65%	9%	60%	14%
	2018	84%	66%	18%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	47	53	69	63	66	60	65				
ELL	53	74	82	56	48	55	50				
BLK	62	65	40	65	62	70	37				
HSP	63	69	80	73	65	67	48				
MUL	83			92							
WHT	64	70	83	79	63	36	68				
FRL	60	69	75	72	66	65	54				

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	53	56	54	64	68						
ELL	52	67		62	75						
BLK	60	69	75	73	90	78	48				
HSP	68	67	73	81	72	67	79				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	66	71		78	86		77				
FRL	66	72	76	78	82	76	67				
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	24	30	45	70	79		42				
ELL	52	63		74	80						
BLK	43	54	38	71	75	73	47				
HSP	60	69	75	79	91	93	57				
WHT	66	52	50	81	78	60	69				
FRL	55	54	54	76	79	78	55				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
---	----

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	68
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	88
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	66
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	68
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 performing component was seen within Science. We had a 15% decline from one year to the next (FY18 - FY19). The achievement was 70% in FY 18 and declined to 55% in FY19. In the past we believed the students were not able to "read" the content, however these results indicate that understanding the content and vocabulary are the concerns. These results are not a trend and came as a surprise. Traditionally, our Science and ELA scores mirrored each other however, in FY19 there was a significant gap between ELA and Science achievement.

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

The greatest decline was evident in Mathematics. Our overall math achievement declined 5% from 79% in FY18 to 74% in FY19. Our learning gains decreased by 21%, from 84% in FY18 to 63% in FY19. Our lowest 25% demonstrated a decrease of 24% from 75% in FY18 to 51% in FY19. We believe that one contributing factor was due to the emphasis placed on ELA instruction and monitoring of data. Additionally, the math instructional block lacked solidification.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is with our ELA Lowest 25%. The state average is 53% and our average is 76%, which is 23% above the state. Our grade 4 ELA Achievement was 69% compared to the states 58%. Our grade 4 teachers utilized Expeditionary Learning and had a District Support Specialist that provided ongoing PD. Within fifth grade, Grade 5 ELA Achievement was 63% compared to the state average of 56%. Contributing factors included ongoing PD with Writing as well as including our grade 5 teachers in the PD with our grade 4 teachers.

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

Our grade 3 math proficiency demonstrated the most improvement with an 13% increase from 67% in FY 18 to 80% in FY 19. Several strategies were implemented including consistent data chats with both teachers, students, and instructional support staff. We refined our math block by explicitly breaking down the components of whole group and small group instruction.

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

Our first area of concern is with student failure (ND). Our goal is to reduce the number of students receiving ND on their report card through providing small group differentiated instruction. The other area of concern is with our retained students at CTES. Our goal is to ensure that they receive strategic remediation to decrease the achievement gap.

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

1. Increase grade 3 ELA Achievement to reach LTO#1 (75% Achievement by 2021)
2. Science achievement
3. Math achievement in grades 3-5
4. Math learning gains, including L25%, in grades 4-5.
5. Positive Culture and Climate through Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	If we deliver effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase reading on grade level by grade 3 (LTO #1) and increase achievement/learning gains within Math and Science (LTO#2).
Rationale	To be aligned with the District's LTO #1 goal for our school, we need to increase third grade achievement. The lowest performing component was seen within Science. We had a 15% decline from one year to the next (FY18 - FY19). The achievement was 55% in FY19. The greatest decline was evident in Mathematics. Our overall math achievement declined 5% from 79% in FY18 to 74% in FY19. Our learning gains decreased by 21%, from 84% in FY18 to 63% in FY19. Our lowest 25% demonstrated a decrease of 19% from 75% in FY18 to 56% in FY19.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA grade three: increase from 56% to 62%. Math achievement: increase from 74% to 77% Math Learn Gains: increase from 63% to 66% Math Low 25: increase from 56% to 62% Science Achievement: increase from 55% to 62%</p> <p>The rationale behind the measured outcome is to ensure we remain an "A" school with a minimum of 62% within the seven categories.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bruce Saulter (bruce.saulter@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiated small group instruction 2. Implement research-based interventions within SAI and through RTI 3. ELA block to include CKLA in grades K-3, and Expeditionary Learning in grades 4 and 5 4. PLC strategic scheduling with a focus to refine best practices within the gradual release model of instruction 5. Implement Social Emotional Learning strategies to support a positive culture and climate towards success
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will support all learners through DI; teachers differentiate instruction through content, process, product, and learning environment. 2. Within SAI we use LLI as a reading intervention for students whose identified need is phonics, text processing or comprehension. Rtl matches instructional strategies and supports to a student need. 3. In CKLA, and EL we receive District support to coach new and veteran teachers within the ELA block. 4. PLC's are planned and executed based on data-driven analysis targeting our most needed areas of deficiency. CTES has successfully utilized this strategy over the past several years to ensure collaboration for school-wide student success. 5. SEL involves acquiring and effectively applying knowledge, attitudes and skills to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, make responsible decisions, and demonstrate behaviors that contribute to academic success.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiated Instruction <p>Teachers who practice differentiation in the classroom design lessons based on students' learning styles, group students by shared interest, topic, or ability for assignments, assess students' learning using formative assessment, manage the classroom to create a safe and</p>

supportive environment, and continually assess and adjust lesson content to meet students' needs. Small group instructional tutors are utilized for needs-based differentiated instruction; lesson plans are provided by our ESE Contact/resource teacher. Fine Arts staff are utilized in enrichment programming for Gifted and high achieving students. (L. Hall, M. Dettling, and Fine Arts Staff)

2. SAI and RTI

CTES utilizes flexible instruction to increase the available SAI blocks. We utilize LLI and additional research based intervention to best match students' area of deficiency with intervention. Groups are flexible and fluid to align with data. K-2 students receive small group interventions provided by a reading resource teacher. Fine Arts staff are utilized for providing intervention support for students in RTI.

(T. Ventriglio, S. Robinson, M. Dettling, and Fine Arts Staff)

3. CKLA/EL

We provide two common planning days to collaborate align instruction. Attendance at bi-weekly PLC's and in classroom support. (L. Hall, Grade Leaders, and District Support Personnel)

4 .PLC's

Flexible scheduling of varied instructional groupings,including vertical planning based on content, strategy, focus, collaboration, and data analysis, (L. Hall, Grade Leaders, and District Support Personnel)

5. SEL

SwPBS committee meets monthly to assess and establish goals. Morning Meeting implemented daily in all classrooms. Time devoted in PLC's to plan Morning Meetings. Group/individual counseling support with mental and behavioral specialist and school counselor. (L. Hall, T. Ventriglio, K. Egipciano, and M. Kress)

All Action Steps listed above are monitored for fidelity by the Leadership Team via lesson plan checks, data analysis and chats, and classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Bruce Saulter (bruce.saulter@palmbeachschools.org)

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).

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase the academic instruction of all students-Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of Florida State Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, Behavior, and climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the

*History of the Holocaust,

*History of African Americans,

*Study of the contributions of Hispanics and Women to the US, and

*Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.

Within our school, teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS guidelines of Social Emotional Learning, showcased by our Morning Meetings; students practice being responsible, respectful, and ready to learn. Adults across the campus will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create the structures for a single school culture of excellence. .

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.

See the PFEP within the Title 1 School-wide Plan or uploaded document

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.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our universal goals for success, following a behavior matrix and by teaching or modeling expected behavior. We instill an appreciation for multicultural diversity through our anti-bullying structured lessons and implementation of the SwPBS programs and protocols. Requests for counseling are submitted by need to our school counselor and our behavioral and mental health professional. The MSD Public Safety Act now requires parents during registration to indicate student's prior referrals to mental health services. For parents that indicate prior mental health referrals, student names are referred to our school counselor, mental health professional, and SBT leader.

Cypress Trails works closely with the community to meet the diverse needs of our students.

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

Over the course of the year, Kindergarten teachers and administrators will meet with area pre-school directors to discuss expectations for in-coming students. During Kindergarten Round-Up, the Kindergarten team will meet with the parents who have students enrolled in our feeder Pre-Kindergarten programs. The team will share information about registration, curriculum, and additional services offered at the school site. Parents will be invited to visit Cypress Trails to meet the staff, tour the facility, and observe the curriculum in action. Articulation meetings for ESE and ELL students are offered to parents to assist in a non-threatening transition into Kindergarten. Student progress is communicated to parents through weekly reports showing mastery of assessed skills. Fifth grade teachers and the guidance counselor work with the middle school to arrange a tour for our out-going fifth grade students, and to facilitate their transition to the sixth grade.

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.

The School-Based Response To Intervention (RTI) Leadership Team meets weekly to review universal screening data, Response to Intervention data and progress monitoring data. This includes monitoring the academic performance of various subgroups. Based on this information, the team identifies the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. Students are identified who are not meeting academic targets and assists curriculum teams with monitoring student

progress. The identified students are offered supplemental interventions (SAI, LLI, tutorials), and monitored over time. Those who do not make adequate progress are referred to the CST. Teachers are given training on intervention strategies to assist identified students and a Case Manager is assigned to assist with monitoring student interventions and recommended strategies.

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

Our Accelerated Math Program (AMP) is offered to students in grade 3-5 to set the students on a pathway to success by completing above grade-level math credits prior to their peers on the standard math track.

Business partners include, but are not limited to Barnes and Noble, Lion Country Safari.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: If we deliver effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase reading on grade level by grade 3 (LTO #1) and increase achievement/learning gains within Math and Science (LTO#2).				\$1,723.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	1941 - Cypress Trails Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	462.02	\$1,723.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used to secure substitutes for teachers to attend training in ELA, Math, Science, and SEL curriculum (Morning Meeting).</i>			
					Total:	\$1,723.00