

Polk County Public Schools

Cypress Junction Montessori



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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cypress Junction Montessori

220 5TH ST SW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.cypressjunction.org

Demographics

Principal: Kris Newman Lake

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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

N/A

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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cypress Junction Montessori

220 5TH ST SW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.cypressjunction.org

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	12%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	33%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
	C	C	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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 Junction Montessori encourages the development of the whole child by providing a comprehensive Montessori education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We do this through:

- Cultivating independent thought, foundational skills, awareness of their environment, empathy for others, social ease, and high self-esteem in every student.
- Establishing within each child the intellectual, emotional, and physical rigor needed to become a self directed learner, flexible thinker, and creative problem solver.
- Supporting each student’s ever-increasing curiosity about the world in which they live.
- Instilling the values and skills necessary to help our students to grow up to be successful global citizens.
- Bringing academic standards and student passions together to fuel a desire to learn.
- Cypress Junction Montessori sets children on a path that embraces creativity, builds self awareness and helps them develop the academic skills, physical tools and personal confidence necessary for lifelong success.

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
Winningham, Karen	Other	<p>Title: Executive Director</p> <p>Cypress Junction Montessori is operated by an Executive Director as well as a Principal who both report to the Board of Directors and are responsible for the daily operations of the school. The two fulfill the responsibility of the administrative staff and undergo an annual evaluation by the board. The Executive Director is responsible for the school from a financial/business perspective and ensures that the school runs and operates smoothly. The ED is responsible for the budget, all financial accounts, as well as overseeing the operation of the school.</p>
Romey, Curtis	Principal	<p>The Principal is responsible for and oversees all on-site personnel as well as protects and maintains the integrity of the Montessori curriculum. It is his/her responsibility to ensure teachers fully understand the tenets of Montessori education and integrate them with the Florida Standards to ensure student success. He/She is vital in communicating with the students as well as the student's parents/families.</p>

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	25	23	22	19	21	23	22	20	18	0	0	0	0	193
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	9	15	4	4	15	0	0	0	0	52

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

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

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

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

12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/10/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	8	12	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	59%	61%	61%	72%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	58%	59%	72%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	49%	54%	69%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	62%	58%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	37%	56%	59%	52%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	52%	52%	54%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	52%	56%	55%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	25 (0)	23 (0)	22 (0)	19 (0)	21 (0)	23 (0)	22 (0)	20 (0)	18 (0)	193 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)	15 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	15 (0)	52 (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	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	48%	23%	58%	13%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	47%	-4%	56%	-13%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
	2018	70%	41%	29%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
07	2019	68%	42%	26%	52%	16%
	2018	53%	42%	11%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	56%	-27%	64%	-35%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	60%	-21%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019	36%	47%	-11%	55%	-19%
	2018	60%	40%	20%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	74%	39%	35%	54%	20%
	2018	42%	40%	2%	54%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	21%	35%	-14%	46%	-25%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	53%	-10%
	2018	19%	51%	-32%	55%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	28%	41%	-13%	48%	-20%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
2018	58%	84%	-26%	71%	-13%
Compare		-58%			

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	0%	50%	-50%	61%	-61%
2018					

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

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	33										
BLK	27	30		20							
HSP	61	61		43	50						
WHT	61	59	40	45	38	50	37				
FRL	65	64		25	23						

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
BLK	46	64		46	73						
HSP	67	50		33	17						
WHT	57	57	55	55	51	50	15	55			

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
BLK	30			40							
HSP	92	73		62	58						
WHT	75	76		58	51		57				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
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	44
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was math--at all data points. Our students scored lower than the county/state.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was gains in the math lowest 25%.

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 component that had the greatest gap as compared to the state was our math learning gains.

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

We showed the most improvement in our science EOC scores. We did this by enriching our science curriculum with multiple hands on labs and lessons.

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

The area of most concern are the students that are scoring 1s on their assessments.

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

1. Increase math lowest 25th %
2. Increase math learning gains
3. Increase ELA lowest 25th %
4. Increase math achievement
5. Continue to increase science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math lowest 25th percentile
Rationale	Due to the fact that CJM's scores were lower than the county and the state by 16%, the goal is for CJM to increase the lowest 25th percentile.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	CJM will increase the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile from 36% to 45% as measured by the 19-20 math FSA. We will pay special attention to our students with disabilities as well as our Black/African American students to ensure they are successful.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Curtis Romey (crome@cypressjunction.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to use the Montessori materials for increased understanding. In addition, the teachers will target the lowest 30% and work with them as needed to increase their understanding. Finally, the students will be working on Freckle for extra work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As a Montessori school, it is important that we maintain fidelity to our curriculum. By targeting the lowest 30% and working with those specific students, we will reinforce what they have been taught as well as provide support in areas of deficiency.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the students and share the information with the teachers 2. Create and implement lesson plans that will target the areas of deficiency 3. Make sure the student understands and is practicing the Montessori material associated with the lesson. 4. Monitor the student's usage of Freckle and adjust it accordingly. 5. Have multiple assessments that check the student's understanding.
Person Responsible	Curtis Romey (crome@cypressjunction.org)

#2	
Title	Math learning gains
Rationale	Due to the fact that CJM was 19% lower than the district, the goal is for CJM to increase the learning gains in math school wide.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	CJM will increase the learning gains from 37% to 45% across the entire school as measured by the 19-20 math FSA. We will pay special attention to our students with disabilities as well as our Black/African American students to ensure they are successful.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Curtis Romey (crome@cypressjunction.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to use the Montessori materials for increased understanding. Teachers will use Freckle and internal assessments to monitor student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As a Montessori school, it is important that we maintain fidelity to our curriculum. By assessing each student's needs and meeting the child where they need to be met with the reinforcement of the Montessori materials, in addition to the usage of Freckle as well as internal assessments, we hope to increase our scores school wide.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify each student's areas of need. 2. Develop Montessori lessons appropriate for each child. Reinforce the lessons with practice. 3. Assess each child and monitor their learning and progress. 4. Use Freckle for additional support as well as progress monitoring. 5.
Person Responsible	Curtis Romey (crome@cypressjunction.org)

#3	
Title	ELA lowest 25th percentile
Rationale	Due to the fact that CJM scored 10% lower than the county and 15% lower than the state on, it is important that CJM increase the scores of the lowest 25th percentile.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	CJM will increase the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile from 39% to 45% across the entire school as measured by the 19-20 ELA FSA. We will pay special attention to our students with disabilities as well as our Black/African American students to ensure they are successful.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Curtis Romey (cromey@cypressjunction.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to use focused small instructional teaching groups using the Reading Wonders curriculum. In addition to using Freckle for additional support, teachers will work individually with the lowest 30% of the students to ensure learning and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As a Montessori school, it is important that we maintain fidelity to our curriculum. By targeting the lowest 30% and working with those specific students, we will reinforce what they have been taught as well as provide support in areas of deficiency.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the levels of all students using Reading Wonders assessments as well as Freckle assessments. 2. Support the students in small group instruction. 3. Continue to reinforce with extra help from Freckle. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Curtis Romey (cromey@cypressjunction.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).

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 25th percentile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math learning gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA lowest 25th percentile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00