

Broward County Public Schools

Cypress 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 Elementary School

851 SW 3RD AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Vanessa Schnur

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: F (28%)
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 Broward 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 Elementary School

851 SW 3RD AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 Elementary is dedicated to meeting the educational needs of all students in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary is committed to educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Schnur, Vanessa	Principal	Mrs. Schnur is the school's instructional leader. She monitors student achievement and teacher performance through formal and informal classroom visits and one-on-one meetings with students and teachers to review data. She provides regular updates and is an active member of all school functions.
Dunbar-Creary, Claudine	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Dunbar-Creary assists with monitoring and the implementation of the schools instructional programs. She assist with student discipline and assist with classroom walkthroughs to give regular feedback to students and teachers. She uses data to monitor referrals and also to assess the needs of students and teachers.
Bray, Jacquelyn	Instructional Coach	Intermediate Literacy- Ms. Bray provides supportive services in the area of English Language Arts (ELA) as needed to improve academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-through to provide ongoing feedback to teachers and students. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents and all stake holders.
Patrick, Kimberlia	Instructional Coach	Science Coach- Ms. Patrick provides support services in the area of science. She provides professional development in the area of science and conducts classroom walk-throughs to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She monitors the use of science programs in K-5 classrooms.
Rucker, Cathy	Instructional Coach	Primary Literacy Coach- Ms. Rucker provides supportive services in the area of English Language Arts (ELA) as needed to improve academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-through to provide ongoing feedback to teachers and students. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents and all stake holders.
Spiteri, Fabiana	Instructional Coach	ELL Coordinator- Ms. Spiteri provides supportive services to our English Language Learners (ELL) as needed to improve their academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-through to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents and all stake holders.
Aversa, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Math Coach- Ms. Aversa provides supportive services in the area of mathematics as needed to improve academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-through to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents and all stake holders.
Peters, Heather	SAC Member	ESE Specialist
Gordon, Jenelle	School Counselor	

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	109	112	113	111	111	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	28	27	16	17	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	18	10	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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	25	28	41	30	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	58	49	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	2	3	3	25	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	42%	59%	57%	37%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	58%	51%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	53%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	65%	63%	51%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	66%	62%	63%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	53%	51%	54%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	46%	53%	41%	45%	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	109 (0)	112 (0)	113 (0)	111 (0)	111 (0)	116 (0)	672 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 ()	27 ()	16 ()	17 ()	25 ()	17 ()	130 (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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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	32%	60%	-28%	58%	-26%
	2018	27%	59%	-32%	57%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	62%	-20%	58%	-16%
	2018	32%	58%	-26%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	38%	59%	-21%	56%	-18%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	65%	-13%	62%	-10%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	67%	-17%	64%	-14%
	2018	39%	63%	-24%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	61%	64%	-3%	60%	1%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	49%	-18%	53%	-22%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	15	59	54	29	58	53	6				

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
ELL	40	58	69	64	70	68	33				
BLK	40	53	50	54	74	57	38				
HSP	42	61	70	63	67	65	31				
WHT	47	64		67	90						
FRL	41	56	60	60	70	58	36				
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	16	38	33	25	50	38	33				
ELL	27	49	51	41	55	58	15				
BLK	32	57	62	46	61	37	49				
HSP	39	55	49	50	60	58	40				
WHT	43	40		43	53						
FRL	37	57	54	48	61	50	49				
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	11	43	50	19	39	36	10				
ELL	25	44	51	45	58	55	23				
BLK	36	51	47	48	58	46	36				
HSP	35	50	57	52	66	60	43				
WHT	50	62		58	67						
FRL	36	50	55	51	64	53	41				

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	56
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	58
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	53
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	57
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 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	67
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	55
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.

Science achievement had the lowest performance at 36%. In previous years, there was 40 minutes of uninterrupted science instruction with a science teacher. However, the new science adoption that is primarily online instruction had a negative impact on performance.

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

Science achievement had the greatest decline (48% to 36%). The factors that contributed to this decline encompass key areas that effect teaching and learning: training teachers, correlating the new adoption materials with tested standards, and building capacity to integrate science into the entire curriculum. The school grade has a reading rate of 42% on grade level/proficiency. Now that the science is taught across the curriculum, we should notice an increase in success as students are reading and writing science.

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.

Science achievement has the greatest gap (17 points) when comparing school and state averages. Broward County initiated a new adoption of science curriculum and materials which created challenges. As with any new curriculum, teachers were not comfortable with the new materials. Students were unfamiliar with the online lesson format.

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

Math learning gains improved by 11 points. Acaletics was a new program initiated. It consisted with front loading and reviewing of standards. Students were rewarded for making gains monthly. Reflex was used to build fluency. Small group reteach and interventions was used as needed and with low 25. Calendar Math was used as a focus in primary grades K-3. Calendar math front loaded and reviewed math standards. Ongoing progress monitoring and formative assessment were helpful with knowing exactly students needs and strengths.

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

Based on the EWS data we need to focus on grades 3, 4, and 5. We have a total of 45 students who have two or more indicators (3rd grade-25 students, 4th grade-9 students, and 5th grade- 13 students).

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. ESE Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Increased Learning Gains
5. Increased Low 25th Percentiles

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	This action plan will ensure increase in student achievement in proficiency and learning gains in all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency levels will increase by 5 points in each grade level. 65% of the students will have learning gains by the end of they year as measured by the district/state formula.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vanessa Schnur (vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use a balanced approach to literacy instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Balanced Literacy is a curricular methodology that integrates various modalities of literacy instruction, which are aimed at guiding students towards proficient and lifelong reading. The balanced literacy approach is characterized by explicit skill instruction and by the use of authentic texts. Teachers integrate instruction with authentic reading and writing and experiences so that students learn how to use literacy strategies and skills and have opportunities to apply what they are learning. There are five different components of balanced literacy: The read aloud, guided reading, shared reading, independent reading, and Word study. Balanced Literacy follows a gradual release model and allows the teacher to differentiate instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PLCs will be enhanced to improve teaching and learning in reading to increase student performance. PLCs will focus on Balanced Literacy components through the use of the literacy continuum. During our collaborative Thursdays, teachers will analyze data, plan instruction, and gather appropriate resources aligned to the Florida Standards. 2. The RTI process will be enhanced to ensure all students are provided the appropriate interventions. Teachers and the school Leadership Team will meet biweekly to monitor student progress and make adjustments as necessary. Teachers will receive support from grade level facilitators to ensure that students needs are met. 3. Staff training will align to student achievement data and teacher need. Professional development will be provided to teachers to improve and support the quality of teaching and learning in order to increase performance. Professional development will focus on literacy. Teachers will attend district training that will support the school's literacy initiative. 4. The Literacy coaches will also model for teachers needing specialized assistance in the Literacy block. 5. Classroom walkthroughs by administration, district, staff, and Instructional Coaches allows us to determine if there is proper implementation of the balanced literacy components.
Person Responsible	Jacquelyn Bray (jacquelyn.bray@browardschools.com)

#2	
Title	ESE
Rationale	This action plan will ensure increase in student achievement in ESE students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our Federal Index for Students With Disabilities will increase by 5 points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vanessa Schnur (vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction which includes differentiated groups and guided reading groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will receive small group guided instruction based on their needs. Balanced Literacy is a curricular methodology that integrates various modalities of literacy instruction, which are aimed at guiding students towards proficient and lifelong reading. The balanced literacy approach is characterized by explicit skill instruction and by the use of authentic texts. Teachers integrate instruction with authentic reading and writing and experiences so that students learn how to use literacy strategies and skills and have opportunities to apply what they are learning. There are five different components of balanced literacy: The read aloud, guided reading, shared reading, independent reading, and Word study. Balanced Literacy follows a gradual release model and allows the teacher to differentiate instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use BAS data to determine reading levels 2. Monitor lesson paths in iReady 3. Progress monitor standards based instruction using School City 4. Use of student data binder in conjunction with student data conferences 5. Students will participate in extended learning opportunities-ESE Staff will contact parents and explain the benefits of participating in extended learning opportunities that are offered by the school
Person Responsible	Heather Peters (heather.oken@browardschools.com)

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.

Cypress Elementary will increase parent involvement through parent nights that focus on academics subjects. We will also increase parental involvement by hosting family nights at various community locations. Wrap-around services that develop family and community partnerships will be provided.

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 counselor has student groups that addresses situations such as divorce, death, social situations. There is also a group for retained 3rd graders, which helps the students cope with the social aspects of being retained. The counselor also meets with students who have difficulty getting along with other students and adults and conducts student meditations if needed. Families are referred to outside counseling services such as Chrysalis and Henderson. We have mentoring opportunities for the students such as 5000 Role Models, peer mentors and adult mentors.

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

In the spring we conduct our annual kindergarten round-up. The ESE Specialist schedules meetings with the receiving school for ESE Students who are transitioning to 6th grade. The school counselor schedules school visits for students attending the feeder pattern middle schools. In August we conduct our annual meet and greet where our families meet the teacher prior to the beginning of the school year. Students who lack school supplies and uniforms are provided with a backpack and uniform vouchers.

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 MTSS Leadership Team meet bi-weekly to collect and review student data. Interventions and instructional services are discussed and recommended for each student. The ESE Specialist coordinates and facilitates RTI meetings. The Instructional Coaches are assigned as Case Managers. Students are identified by the classroom teachers, formative testing data, other educators, and by parent request. The team analyzes data, including anecdotes, attendance, student observations, academics, and social emotional issues. (TIER 1). Identified students that are struggling will be given additional interventions (TIER 2), different from Tier 1. If Tier 2 interventions are unsuccessful Tier 3 interventions are implemented. Progress monitoring graphs are used to track Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Tier 2 and 3 will be monitored bi-monthly. Schoolwide data (Tier 1) is monitored on a monthly basis through data chats with teachers. Title I funding is used for: salaries to hire additional teachers, professional development, supplemental instructional materials, extended learning opportunities, and parent involvement activities.

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

We have a Career Day to expose our students to an array of professions throughout the community. Teachers include college and career topics in their instruction. Through our partnership with the 5000 Role Models students are able to meet and interact with community members who talk about career paths with the students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA					\$38,860.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
			1781 - Cypress Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$35,915.00	
			1781 - Cypress Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,850.00	
			Notes: Core Connections				
			1781 - Cypress Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,095.63	
			Notes: Reading Mastery				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESE					\$0.00
Total:							\$38,860.63