

Polk County Public Schools

Cypress Junction Montessori



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Cypress Junction Montessori

220 5TH ST SW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.cypressjunction.org

Demographics

Principal: Kris Newman Lake

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Cypress Junction Montessori

220 5TH ST SW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.cypressjunction.org

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	0%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

We do this through:

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Winningham, Karen	Other	<p>Title: Executive Director</p> <p>Cypress Junction Montessori is operated by an Executive Director as well as a Principal who both report to the Board of Directors and are responsible for the daily operations of the school. The two fulfill the responsibility of the administrative staff and undergo an annual evaluation by the board. The Executive Director is responsible for the school from a financial/business perspective and ensures that the school runs and operates smoothly. The ED is responsible for the budget, all financial accounts, as well as overseeing the operation of the school.</p>
Hollinger, Auri	Principal	<p>Title: Principal</p> <p>Cypress Junction Montessori is operated by an Executive Director as well as a Principal who both report to the Board of Directors and are responsible for the daily operations of the school. The two fulfill the responsibility of the administrative staff and undergo an annual evaluation by the board. The Principal is responsible for the school from a curriculum/educational perspective and ensures that the school runs and operates smoothly.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kris Newman Lake

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.*

6

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	20	22	25	21	20	25	23	21	19	0	0	0	0	196
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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 6/4/2020

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	25	23	22	19	21	23	22	20	18	0	0	0	0	193
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	9	15	4	4	15	0	0	0	0	52

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	48%	23%	58%	13%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	47%	-4%	56%	-13%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
	2018	70%	41%	29%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
07	2019	68%	42%	26%	52%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	42%	11%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	56%	-27%	64%	-35%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	60%	-21%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019	36%	47%	-11%	55%	-19%
	2018	60%	40%	20%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	74%	39%	35%	54%	20%
	2018	42%	40%	2%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	21%	35%	-14%	46%	-25%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
2018	58%	84%	-26%	71%	-13%
Compare		-58%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	61%	-61%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33										
BLK	27	30		20							
HSP	61	61		43	50						
WHT	61	59	40	45	38	50	37				
FRL	65	64		25	23						
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	46	64		46	73						
HSP	67	50		33	17						

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
WHT	57	57	55	55	51	50	15	55			
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
BLK	30			40							
HSP	92	73		62	58						
WHT	75	76		58	51		57				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	47
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	44
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was math.

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

We showed the most improvement in our science EOC scores. We did this by enriching our science curriculum with SRA Science Laboratory, progress monitoring, and more teacher support and resources.

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

The area of most concern is the decline in math.

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

1. Increase math lowest 25th %
2. Increase math learning gains
3. SWD achievement
4. ELL achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Cypress Junction Montessori's scores were lower than than the county and the state by 16%, the goal for CJM is to increase the lowest 25th percentile. We will do this by offering multiple opportunities to receive on-site tutoring as well as implemented blended learning such as flipped classrooms for our secondary students.

Measurable Outcome: CJM will increase the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile from 36% to 45% as measured by the 2020-2021 math FSA. We will pay special attention to our students with disabilities as well as our minority students. It would be advantageous for these students to do “values-affirmation” exercises — fifteen-minute writing tasks in which the students were asked to expound on something that mattered deeply to them (family, religion, and extracurricular pursuit). Students that are of the minority, even those with disabilities aren’t just worrying about the exam itself, but about what people might think of them and their ethnic group once the results come in.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Auri Hollinger (ahollinger@cypressjunction.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to use the Montessori materials for increased understanding. In addition, the teachers will target the lowest 30% and provide support as needed to increase their understanding. Finally, the students will be working on Freckle for extra support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As a Montessori school, it is important that we maintain fidelity to our curriculum. By targeting the lowest 30% and working with those specific students, we will reinforce what they have been taught as well as provide additional support in areas of defined gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify each student's areas of needs.
2. Create and implement lesson plans that will target the areas of deficiency.
3. Make sure the student follows the Montessori lessons with fidelity.
4. Monitor the student's Freckle usage and adjust the lessons accordingly.
5. Monitor learning gains through multiple assessments that check for student's understanding and proficiency.

Person Responsible Auri Hollinger (ahollinger@cypressjunction.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Due to the fact that CJM's learning gains were 19% lower than the district, the goal is for CJM to increase the learning gains in math school wide.

Measurable Outcome:

CJM will increase the learning gains from 37% to 45% across the entire school as measured by the 2020-2021 math FSA. We will pay special attention to students with disabilities and minority students. It would be advantageous for these students to do “values-affirmation” exercises — fifteen-minute writing tasks in which the students were asked to expound on something that mattered deeply to them (family, religion, and extracurricular pursuit). Students that are of the minority, even those with disabilities aren’t just worrying about the exam itself, but about what people might think of them and their ethnic group once the results come in.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Auri Hollinger (ahollinger@cypressjunction.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will continue to use the Montessori materials for increased understanding. Teachers will use Freckle and internal assessments to monitor student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As a Montessori school, it is important that we maintain fidelity to our curriculum. By assessing each student’s needs and meeting the child where they need to be met , in addition to the usage of Freckle and internal assessments, we hope to increase our scores school wide.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify each student’s areas of need.
2. Develop Montessori lessons appropriate for each child. Reinforce the lessons with practice.
3. Assess each child and monitor their learning and progress.
4. Use Freckle for additional support as well as progress monitoring.

Person Responsible

Auri Hollinger (ahollinger@cypressjunction.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will enhance teacher leadership, thus giving teachers a voice in decision making. This should impact scores significantly.

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 Junction Montessori was founded and built by a group of local parents and community members whose vision was to make Montessori education available to students in the Greater Winter Haven community. Community support comes from parents, grandparents, guardians, community leaders, business professionals, and more. Cypress Junction Montessori has instituted a co-teaching environment for our various teaching levels. Teachers in our "lower elementary" classrooms for example (3 in total with 1 assistant), work collaboratively and meet on a weekly (daily if necessary) basis to discuss education direction, lesson planning, specific student needs, etc. In addition to the classroom level collaboration, teacher staff meetings are held monthly to foster positive communication regarding what's happening at the school overall. The small community and staff allow for visibility and transparency in education needs. It fosters a great team environment where sharing techniques and successes is evident and beneficial. Family participation is a key element of a Montessori education. We have created a Parent Involvement Group who meets regularly to assess school needs and assist where/as necessary. Our community of administrators and teachers work the car line and front lobby each morning to ensure face time is had with our entire family community on a daily basis. We also release a parent newsletter once a month on a school wide level, as well as a classroom specific level to keep parents informed of the happenings at the school, and maintain the open line of communication. Parent conferences are scheduled school wide, as well as upon request.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00