

Lake County Schools

Cypress Ridge 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Frana

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2018

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

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	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

It is the mission of Cypress Ridge to ensure all of our students acquire the knowledge and skills essential to achieve high levels of success and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a school community we believe in:

Collaborating to support all learners

Celebrating success

Integrating cross-curricular standards with a focus on STEAM

Using evidence to drive instruction

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
Voytko, Scott	Principal	Instructional Leader voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us
Schoenthaler, Virginia	Instructional Coach	Instructional Leader, STEAM schoenthalerv@lake.k12.fl.us
Perez, Betzaida	Administrative Support	Supporting the instructional leaders perezb@lake.k12.fl.us
Brouhard, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Professional Development and Instructional Leader brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us
Spanswick, Marcella	Instructional Coach	ELA gelardim@lake.k12.fl.us
Taylor, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist taylors3@lake.k12.fl.us
Frey, Dana	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader Freyd@lake.k12.fl.us

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	95	104	83	101	86	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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)

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

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	0	5	5	3	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	5	5	3	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	88%	58%	57%	80%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	57%	58%	55%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	49%	53%	43%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	60%	63%	75%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	56%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	51%	43%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	54%	53%	60%	49%	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	95 (0)	104 (0)	83 (0)	101 (0)	86 (0)	87 (0)	556 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (5)	0 (5)	0 (3)	0 (10)	0 (8)	0 (31)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (6)	1 (3)	1 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (10)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (6)	3 (6)	7 (7)	10 (19)

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	84%	60%	24%	58%	26%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	57%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	60%	32%	58%	34%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	90%	59%	31%	56%	34%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%
	2018	88%	65%	23%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	61%	21%	64%	18%
	2018	80%	60%	20%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
	2018	78%	54%	24%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	60	71	63	47	50	32	30				

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
ASN	80			80							
BLK	83	79		78	57						
HSP	79	82		72	55						
MUL	92	70		77	50						
WHT	91	72	75	85	67	30	85				
FRL	81	71	87	76	56	50	75				
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	48	42	33	47	35	36					
ASN	90			90							
BLK	86	64		77	64						
HSP	69	71		69	57						
MUL	68	57		74	64						
WHT	90	63	48	85	65	41	82				
FRL	77	70	57	72	63	53	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	50	34	42	50	48	33	47				
BLK	82			71							
HSP	73	61		61	57		64				
MUL	71	60		57	40						
WHT	81	54	45	78	69	55	60				
FRL	73	51	40	59	47	32	50				

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	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	
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	80
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	74
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	72
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	72
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	72
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	71
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.

Math Lower Quartile was our lowest and dropped 5 points to 39%. We lacked targeted intensive interventions to under performing students in 4th and 5th grade.

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

Math Lower Quartile by 5% points. All other areas remained or improved. Lack of targeted interventions in 4th and 5th grade math block.

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.

Math Lower Quartile by 12% points.. Lack of targeted interventions and lack of understanding of standard. This has been the case for the last 3 years.

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

ELA LQ by 28% points. Independent reading with conferring and targeted intervention led to this increase.

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

No students qualified for EWS.

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

1. Math LQ
2. Math LG
3. Science Proficiency

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Focus on student learning/purpose

Rationale In past we have focused on tasks and activities. By unpacking standards and creating learning targets for students, we can focus on the evidence of student learning instead of the pacing of our content. This will allow us to ensure all students learn the essential skills necessary.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

We expect to see an increase in proficiency by 3%. By unpacking standards and creating learning targets, we will have better tools for determining the skills students still need to learn to be successful.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Admin and teachers will plan weekly as a part of our PLC. We will focus on Questions 1 and 2 on Wednesday, and Questions 3 & 4 of the PLC model following the formative assessment. The formative will be tied to a well planned, standard based purpose. During walkthroughs, admin will ask, "what are you learning, why are you learning it, and how will you know if your successful" in order to gauge if students understand the purpose.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

If teachers work collaboratively on unpacking the standards into learning targets, they will ensure assignments and assessments better align to state standards.

Action Step

Description

1. Unpacking Standard examples for teacher planning
2. Provide PD and examples of planning for purpose each Wednesday
3. Use the walkthrough learning tool
4. Provide teachers with feedback

Person Responsible

Marcella Spanswick (gelardim@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Implement PLC model of professional development
Rationale	PLC are the best tool to improve student learning at the school level. It provides structured opportunities for teachers to share evidence of student learning and collaborate on ways to improve their practice.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers will focus on planning for math in their PLC structured time. By placing students in interventions and enrichments from formative assessments, student learning gains in math will increase by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nicole Brouhard (brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher collaboration is a powerful tool to increase student achievement. Teachers will share evidence of student learning from formative assessments and plan interventions and enrichment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers must share student results on a weekly basis so we can reflect and make the necessary changes to our instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a structured time to address the 4 PLC questions. 2. Provide teachers with the tools to plan and coaches to support their implementation. 3. Provide examples of assessments so teachers can understand the FSA level descriptors.
Person Responsible	Virginia Schoenthaler (schoenthalerv@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Intervention
Rationale	Our interventions in 2018-2019 were not successful with our under achieving students. If we do not close the math gap in elementary school, the student will struggle to pass Algebra 1.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect to increase our math LQ scores by 23 points to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Taylor (taylors3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will plan interventions and enrichment from teacher created formative assessments. Teachers will use Florida Descriptors and Item Specs to create assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By understanding how the standard will be assessed, and what it takes for students to achieve level 4 and 5 questions, student achievement will increase. We will attend PLC planning time with 3rd through 5th grade teams weekly to ensure students are receiving the necessary interventions and enrichment to take them to satisfactory, proficiency, or mastery.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with item specs and descriptors 2. Help teachers protect intervention time 3. Support and monitor interventions by walking through during interventions 4. Hire teacher tutors to work with students before/after school.
Person Responsible	Kelly Rayburn (rayburnk@lake.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).

We will continue to provide training to new staff members on Covey's 7 habits, and to recognize these 7 habits during Terrific Kid Events. The administration has eliminated several programs (Moby Max, AR, Time for kids) to better align funds toward supporting our vision and collective commitments. We have implemented SIPPS in K-3 to address our Phonics deficiencies from years of not having a Core phonics program.