

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Cypress Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Cypress Elementary School

2251 LAKESIDE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Libby Raymond

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## Cypress Elementary School

2251 LAKESIDE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.**

A School of Excellence for all Learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Cypress Elementary will provide a comprehensive educational experience that results in student gains in all areas.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raymond, Libby	Principal	To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student success.
Nicholson, Randa	Assistant Principal	To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student success. To take ownership of the school's stocktake meetings and ensure all stakeholders know: who, what, when, why, and how they are meeting the needs of their specified areas. If areas are not making gains or being accountable, an edit of the stocktake plan for that area will need to be adjusted and monitored closely for positive results.
Waller, Marcia	Instructional Coach	Will monitor the MTSS process ensure students work through the Tiers to achieve success at an appropriate pace. Identify students who are regressing and create a plan with the MTSS team to put in place for the student to be successful.
Becerra, Helayne	Instructional Coach	Will work with all staff to ensure a literature rich culture cross-curricular for all students. The coach will work co teach, model, and give feedback to all instructional personnel to have a laser focus on meeting the needs of the students while hitting the depth of knowledge of the standards.
Kaplan, Danielle	Instructional Coach	Will work with all new teachers and new-to-Cypress teachers to ensure they develop a good foundation to classroom management and all teaching duties to be successful in the classroom. Assist teachers in their classroom roles and ensure teachers are compliant with their certifications.
Duran, Maritza	Instructional Coach	Will work with students and teachers to utilize ELlevation and ELL strategies to meet the needs of our students and help with achieving learning gains.
Bernardo, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Will work with all staff to ensure a problem solving culture cross-curricular for all students. The coach will work co teach, model, and give feedback to all instructional personnel to have a laser focus on meeting the needs of the students while hitting the depth of knowledge of the standards and increasing discourse.
Lewis, Stephanie	Teacher, ESE	PLC Lead

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Libby Raymond



**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

35

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	4	11	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/28/2020

### 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	
Number of students enrolled	75	81	67	105	107	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	9	13	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	24	16	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

**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	4	15	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	
Number of students enrolled	75	81	67	105	107	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	9	13	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	24	16	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

**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	4	15	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	53%	53%	57%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	39%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	51%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	55%	63%	56%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	59%	62%	40%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	51%	32%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	49%	53%	52%	54%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%
	2018	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	54%	-8%	62%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	53%	2%	64%	-9%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	53%	48%	5%	60%	-7%
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	45%	13%	53%	5%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
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	29	67	63	33	56	41	18				
ELL	42	58	65	43	52	38	50				
BLK	58	73		53	60						
HSP	52	66	62	51	56	43	58				
WHT	46	50		75	69						
FRL	49	70	66	49	58	48	67				
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	13	35	52	17	45	56	19				
ELL	36	58	67	37	52	56	30				
BLK	44	57		48	43						
HSP	49	58	60	51	48	49	42				
WHT	61	69		70	69						
FRL	47	57	61	49	51	46	39				

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	4	28	29	22	18	20					
ELL	31	38	45	46	36	33	26				
BLK	40	33		52	28						
HSP	44	40	46	54	40	36	48				
WHT	76	45		76	45						
FRL	46	42	47	49	40	32	44				

### 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	57
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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.**

Out of the seven components FSA Math lowest quartile scored the lowest with 45% overall for the 2018-2019 school year. This is not a trend from the previous two years scores

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

The data component that had the biggest gap compared to the state average was Math learning gains with a difference of 2%. The state average was a 59% and Cypress earned a 57%.

**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 that had the biggest gap when looking at STATE data compared to the state average was Math learning gains with a difference of 2%. The state average was a 59% and Cypress earned a 57%.

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

The component that showed the most improvement is the FCAT science from 2019 with a 60% proficiency, compared to the year before with a 44%. This is an increase of 16% points. This is the first year for this component to show the most improvement, therefore it is not a trend. All students were placed in flexible groups by achievement level into one of 4 research based literacy programs for an extra hour per day in addition to the ELA block. In intermediate grade levels, students were placed in flexible groups and participated in a boot camp from January- May.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

29 3rd graders that have two or more EWSR indicators. Compile and list and identify which areas and a plan for them.

16 1st grade students who have an attendance issue, need to be identified and a plan in place. 15 4th graders students who have an attendance issue, need to be identified and a plan in place.

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

1. 5th grade who had two or more EWSR indicators
2. 2nd grade attendance
3. 4th grade attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement.</p> <p>Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams.</p> <p>Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.</p> <p>It was found through the Insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2019-2020</p> <p>Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 15% 2020-2021 20%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Increase teachers leadership roles within the school Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers_</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students-and what they themselves-need to succeed. If teachers use data to make decisions on improving instruction, leadership teams can ensure that all teachers are focused on the standards and improving learning. Working together, teachers can coach each other and learn from each other. This will boost morale and make it more likely that teachers become stronger and stay in the profession. The team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help with improvement (Gates Foundation 2019)</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1 \_Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down-and towards conducting experiments (such as small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole.
- 2 The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project is not working.
3. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals\_

4. Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrator's . Both are equally valuable and necessary, especially with leadership teams/

**Person Responsible** Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Given the 2019 -2020 school data finding that only 36% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2020-2021 will be to raise the math proficiency by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. According to Hattie's research, Meta cognitive mathematics instruction which involves multi stepped problem solving, has a desired effect of 0.69. (Hattie-2009)

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.
2. Staff will assist students monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
3. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient in mathematics based on a variety of assessments. In addition, advanced students will be offered to students to extend their learning.
4. Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that connect to a sequence of learning.
5. Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques, supported by feedback and the ability to self assess progress related to the outcome.
6. Teachers will utilize formative assessments to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the 2018- 2019, ELA proficiency 52%, which is below the state average of 55%. The district average is 47%, however, the goal is to increase to the state average of 55% while focusing 011 all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year literacy scores on the ELA FSA in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades will increase by five percent (5%) from the 2019-2020 data collected.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Helayne Becerra (helayne.becerra@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and in meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.
3. Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered.
4. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.
5. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
6. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
7. Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.
8. Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify student needs.

**Person Responsible** Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Strengthen collaborative process to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met through the active use of Professional Learning Communities According Hattie's research, Professional Learning Communities have an effect size of 0.93, that positively impacts student achievement. (Hattie 2009)
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By the end of the of 2020-2021 school year Cypress Elementary will increase learning gains in ELA and Math by 5% through collaborative processes and PLC.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Stephanie Lewis (stephanie.lewis@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research states PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. 1.Administration, PLC Lead, and PLC Guide Coalition will meet to discuss all accountability area collaborative teams, to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. PLC Seven stages rubric will be used to measure Pre-Mid-End of school year progress of the PLC teams by the Principal. With the addition of formative assessment scores for Math, ELA and Science PLCs. 3. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal of the Area of Focus
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	If teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction student achievement will increase. Resources from district MTSS administrators will guide implementation. The effect size for PLC learning communities is .93 (Hattie,2009)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PLC's will meet monthly during early release days and on two (2) planning periods a month in order to assess, analyze, reflect and revise plans on course progression of individual student needs as a collaborative team. PLC professional development will be provided monthly throughout the school year to the school PLC lead via the school district , who will in turn disseminate to Cypress faculty. Each grade level team will have an embedded Cypress leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process. Any teams that are struggling will receive mentoring through the school PLC lead and leadership team. Each grade level team will utilize district supplied formative assessments and NWEA assessment software. 2. Monthly Stocktake meetings will discuss data analysis of the PLC stages and provide feedback to the PLC school lead. 3. The ELL task force will provide support to PLC teams during meetings.

**Person Responsible** Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 showed no sub groups below the ESSA level 41 %. Of all subgroups, ELL and ESE subgroups were in the lower range.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	ELL and ESE subgroups will increase to 43% in 2020-2021.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately 7 challenging learning experiences for all their students. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, ELLEVATION training, and ESE support strategies.
5. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

**Person Responsible** Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed a 57% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020-2021 this question will be increased 10%.

**Person responsible  
for monitoring  
outcome:**

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Students have different learning styles and needs. We must assess individual learning styles and be flexible in allowing students to succeed by meeting their individual needs.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered,. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.
2. Teacher will build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning.
8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.
9. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will be developed.
10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required

**Person Responsible** Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)



**#7. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide post secondary culture for all students****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

A college-going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students-not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low income levels, underrepresented minorities, and families where there are no college grads.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

The 19-20 grade distribution was- A-10%, B 10%, C20%, D 35%, F25%

**Person responsible  
for monitoring  
outcome:**

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Schools with a strong future plan, that engages all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are strong in implementing postsecondary work, Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. In these schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of ways meet their needs.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequence activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a postsecondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.
5. Administration and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.
6. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

**Person  
Responsible**

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

**#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Science education is well suited to active young children because it creates habits of mind, develops their capacity to engage in scientific inquiry and teach them how to reason through the content. It also allows them to explore the world and discover new things. It is an important part of the foundation for education for all.

**Measurable Outcome:** The 2019-20 Science achievement was 62%. In 2020 we will increase that score by 3%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problem

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands on, minds on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught to rely on primarily lectures and textbooks (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1\_ Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC.
- 2\_ Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards
- 3\_ Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, 2 column notes and interactive notebooks.
- 4\_ Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery
- 5\_ ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL. compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses
- 6\_ Teachers will provide individual student data chats \_
- 7\_ The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and if the need arises.
8. Teachers will provide Tier instructional support based on grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**The school leadership will closely monitor for any remaining areas of improvement through the monthly stocktake discussions and meetings. Swift action and goal setting will help the team identify any areas that need to be addressed.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently

communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate

how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been

created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns

among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school

suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups

within a school and What needs to be done. Such as, Establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing

disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training

and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have

resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively

make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master

schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, The school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

#### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

### Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$539.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0851 - Cypress Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	3.0	\$539.60
			Notes: Hoover cams To provide lessons to digital students			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide post secondary culture for all students				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
Total:						\$539.60