Cypress Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jeanne Krapfl

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2019-20 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 Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Pasco 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

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us

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	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary School is a learning community dedicated to developing resilient, lifelong learners who will work towards reaching their highest potential.

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
Berryhill, Tammy	Principal	
Tonello, Erika	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Erika Tonello
		Nancy Bevan, Kindergarten Teacher

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	111	134	96	132	116	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	732
Attendance below 90 percent	0	350	36	23	18	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
One or more suspensions	5	6	5	7	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failure in Either ELA or Math	2	23	11	15	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	28	20	19	19	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 7/30/2020

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	100	124	87	108	130	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	17	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	27	27	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	14	7	26	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	100	124	87	108	130	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	17	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	27	27	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	14	7	26	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	57%	58%	57%	56%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	50%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	60%	63%	56%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	61%	62%	61%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	51%	65%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	53%	45%	49%	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	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	58%	5%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	59%	-6%	62%	-9%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	62%	0%	64%	-2%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	45%	58%	-13%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	54	55	25	49	41	21				
HSP	71	80	70	58	60	55	58				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	55	53	53	54	51	35	47				
FRL	50	56	57	45	50	41	42				

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	17	22	14	25	32	19	17				
ASN	69			85							
HSP	50	33		49	35						
MUL	67	54		53	54						
WHT	54	45	17	58	43	22	53				
FRL	45	37	16	47	34	21	40				

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	30	36	35	32	58	76	52				
ELL	62			62							
ASN	92			100							
HSP	47	50		47	43		38				
MUL	69			75							
WHT	56	59	50	55	61	65	45				
FRL	51	59	53	48	59	58	38				

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	52
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	49
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.

The 2019 Math FSA indicated that the Math Lowest 25th Percentile was our lowest performance. Although this was our lowest performance, it was an increase of 14%.

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

Our overall Math Achievement decreased from 58% to 56% on the FSA 2019. Behavior disruptions.

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.

Fifth grade Math FSA 2019 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Need to continue intentionally planning for students to grapple with the math standards and do more of the rigorous work.

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

Fourth grade ELA FSA had the greatest improvement. Time was spent on planning for the reading standards and the students' evidence of high expectations.

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

The main area of concern from the 2019-2020 EWS data is the students with one of more suspensions. This past year, we had the social behavior program at our school which caused our number of suspensions to increase. We are studying Conscious Discipline currently. Team attended the Conscious Discipline professional development.

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

1. High Impact Instruction - Teachers will plan, deliver, assess and monitor standards-based instruction matched to the rigor of the standards in all content areas.
2. Data Driven Instruction – Build a multi-tiered system of support for students to ensure 75% or more of students achieve growth in all content areas.
3. Collaborative Culture – In order to strengthen our collaborative culture, Cypress staff will work together to develop a stronger collective responsibility of all staff.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The staff will actively participate in Conscious Discipline professional development to deepen their tool box of social emotional learning. Staff and students will learn strategies for trauma sensitive care. The school discipline team will monitor and problem solve around areas of need.

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.

Cypress Elementary School send weekly phone calls to the families.
Cypress has a Facebook page and school website.
Parents and community. members are part of our School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Organization. Every Friday is school spirt day.
Every morning is started with a Smart Start morning meeting.
Staff provided input to our way of work which includes core beliefs, commitments and norms.
May parent volunteer opportunities.
Several night activities where families come to school for collaboration and community building.
Local women's group supports our tier 3 students with weekly food for the weekend, Christmas presents and school supplies.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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