Cypress Creek Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Creek Elementary School

6100 S WILLIAMSON BLVD, Port Orange, FL 32128

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/cypresscreek/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Kristina Kania

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2017

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 Creek Elementary School

6100 S WILLIAMSON BLVD, Port Orange, FL 32128

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/cypresscreek/pages/default.aspx

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	No	39%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

The Cypress Creek Elementary family will work as a team to encourage student achievement, safety, respect, and citizenship in order to ensure success of each and every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

Cypress Creek cares about the success of every student. Our goal is to set high expectations and provide a quality education.

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
Bronson, Adrian	Principal	Instructional Leadership; School Management; Human Resources; Professional Development
Hemings, Susan	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security; Professional Development; discipline; instructional leadership
Bray, Trisha	Teacher, K-12	KG teacher; SAC Chair
Walker, Sofia	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade teacher; SAC Secretary
Moulton, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Mallard, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	
Grabowski, Christina	Teacher, PreK	
Green, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Larrimore, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Leathead, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Ringvelski, Joni	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/3/2017, Kristina Kania

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.*

13

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.*

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	79	97	126	112	96	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	117	131	130	129	141	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	117	131	130	129	141	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	75%	56%	57%	72%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	56%	58%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	46%	53%	42%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	59%	63%	82%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	69%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	65%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	53%	76%	59%	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	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	58%	15%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	59%	16%	64%	11%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	56%	15%	53%	18%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	22	32	32	29	33	29	25				
ELL	44	67	50	59	56						
ASN	75	92		81	83						
BLK	79	75		72	45						
HSP	69	67		60	38		47				
MUL	64	56		68	50						
WHT	76	67	50	71	59	39	75				
FRL	61	60	44	66	54	33	60				
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	23	37	38	26	30	28					
ELL	37	64		53	57						
ASN	86	69		85	73						
BLK	63	36		53	45						
HSP	70	57	55	78	60		86				
MUL	71	70		52	40						
WHT	75	57	43	76	49	38	73				

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
FRL	65	53	37	67	48	35	73				

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	18	5		38	47	44	8				
ELL	33	58		67	75						
ASN	84	80		100	85		90				
BLK	45	45		60	55						
HSP	59	76		81	76						
MUL	72	82		78	73						
WHT	74	62	40	83	67	64	77				
FRL	53	48	19	67	58	66	56				

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	62
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
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	60
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	62
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	54
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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile at 36%--this is below the district (43%) and state (51%) averages. Contributing factors included staffing issues with vacancies for ESE positions and various teachers who were new to their grade levels and/or ESE positions, lost instructional days due to hurricanes.

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

Math achievement declined from 75% in 2018 to 71% in 2019. The contributing factors included teachers new to the grade levels and/or subject area, ESE vacancies and teachers new to support facilitation, hurricane days.

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

Science Achievement was 73% for our school, compared to the state average of 53%. The factors that contributed to this included K-5 focus on science lessons to include hands-on science lessons, fair-game review lessons delivered to 5th grade students during "Way Back Wednesdays" and science is included on the master schedule daily.

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

ELA Learning Gains rose from 57% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. School actions included school-wide professional learning to increase teacher efficacy with the ELA standards, use of instructional programs such as SIPPS and Ready Reading, and a school-wide focus on small group instruction and interventions to support student improvement in all areas of reading and at all grade levels.

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

The team reviewed average daily attendance rate of 96% and discussed data for students who are chronically absent (6.4%), which included 32 individual students. Discipline data was discussed and reviewed. There were 16 out of school suspensions and 14 in school suspensions during the 2019-20 school year, but this data reflects only 3 quarters due to school closures for Covid-19.

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

Math lowest quartile (focus on SWD's)
ELA lowest quartile (focus on SWD's)
Math learning gains
Math achievement—especially due to potential Covid-19 learning gaps
5th grade all subjects—these students did not take 4th grade FSA in 2019-20 due to Covid-19

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Lowest Quartile As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it revealed that 36% of our lowest quartile math students demonstrated proficiency which is below the district and state average. The SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students making learning gains and meeting proficiency on the math assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math lowest quartile proficiency from 36% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction/teacher clarity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie, teacher clarity has a .75 effect size. Teacher clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that do not promote learning by identifying the critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan
a.
b.
c.
2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based
on school data and SIP goal.
a. Teacher Clarity- Use The Teacher Clarity Playbook, Grades K-12: A Hands-On Guide to Creating Learning Intentions and Success Criteria for Organized, Effective Instruction (Corwin Literacy) by Olivia Amador
b. Teachers will decompose grade-level standards to provide clarity to students for learning criteria and success.
c.
3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD
and LQ.
4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow up.
5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional
learning.
6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of
skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching.
7. Monitor student progress through iReady data, School City data.

Person Responsible	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	23% of SWD demonstrated proficiency in ELA with 37% making learning gains, both of which are below the state and district average. 26% of SWD demonstrated proficiency in math with 30% making learning gains, both of which are below the state and district average.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the proficiency of SWD in ELA from 23% to 28%. Increase ELA learning gains for SWD from 37% to 42%. Increase the percentage of SWD demonstrating proficiency in math from 26% to 31%. Increase math learning gains for SWD from 30% to 35%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie, providing comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students has a .77 effect size. This includes providing attention to sequencing, drill-repetition-practice, segmenting information into parts or units for later synthesis, controlling task difficulty through prompts and cues, making use of technology, systematically modeling problem solving steps, and making use of small interactive groups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan
2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based
on school data and SIP goal.
a. ESE continuum of services training to assist teachers in understanding accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities for effective implementation in general education and ESE classrooms.
b. Effective Progress Monitoring Practices with Formative Assessments to drive instructional practices
• Model formative assessments
• Make and Take formative Assessment tools
3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD
and LQ.
4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow up.
5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional
learning (small group instruction).
6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of
skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching.
7. Monitor student progress through iReady data, FSA data, School City data.

Person Responsible	Susan Hemings (smheming@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our needs assessment and analysis of the 2018-2019 FSA scores, it revealed that 76% of our 3rd grade students scored a level 3 or higher. With the covid pandemic and the cancellation of the 4th quarter of the 2019-2020 school year, there will be significant gaps in the learning for this group who are now our current 5th grade students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math proficiency from 71% to 75% overall
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction/teacher clarity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie, teacher clarity has a .75 effect size. Teacher clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that do not promote learning by identifying the critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in the VCS Professional Learning Plan
2. Cypress Creek will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based
on school data and SIP goal.
a. Utilize standards to develop learning intentions and success criteria in student-friendly language
b. Teachers will decompose the Math and B.E.S.T standards to develop a deeper understanding of student learning criteria.
3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs. PLCs will include monitoring SWD
and LQ.
4. Administration and Academic Coach will provide PLC support and follow up.
5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional
Learning. (For example, teachers will attend the PL, "Diving Deeper into Math Strategies during pre-planning.)
6. Administration and Academic Coach will monitor the implementation of
skills from PL, provide actionable feedback, and follow-up coaching.
7. Monitor student progress through iReady data and growth monitoring tool, FSA data, School City data.

Person Responsible	Adrian Bronson (apbronso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Using the iReady data and growth monitoring tool, School City data, district assessments, school based assessments, FSA data.
a. district-provided training for School-City
b. Admin and coaching support in PLCs and implementation

Increase SWD proficiency in both math and reading
Increase Math proficiency overall
a. Effective Small Group Instruction: Assist teachers in developing small group lessons through classroom observations, teacher modeling and Response to Intervention.
• Define the reading process
• Model Small Group Lesson Sequence

b. Effective Progress Monitoring Practices with Formative Assessments to drive instructional practices
• Model formative assessments
• Make and Take formative Assessment tools

c. ESE continuum of services training to assist teachers in understanding accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities for effective implementation in general education and ESE classrooms.
d. Book Tasting for Individualized Book Studies with the following texts:

Book Tasting for Individualized Book Studies with the following Texts:

Tech Like a PIRATE: Using Classroom Technology to Create an Experience and Make Learning Memorable by Matt Miller
Teach Like a PIRATE: Increase Student Engagement, Boost Your Creativity, and Transform Your Life as an Educator by Dave Burgess

Make Learning Magical: Transform Your Teaching and Create Unforgettable Experiences in Your Classroom by Tisha Richmond

When Kids Lead: An Adult's Guide to Inspiring, Empowering, and Growing Young Leaders by Todd Nesloney

One Thing by Gary Keller

Social-emotional Learning, Sanford Harmony, Youth Mental Health training

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.

A positive school culture and environment is promoted daily through the use of CHAMPS and positive behavioral instruction and supports in all classrooms, common areas and buses. SEL is addressed daily with a focus on schoolwide Social-Emotional Learning, including the use of Sanford Harmony lessons by teachers and school counselors. Administrators and teachers provide positive referrals to increase student engagement and target appropriate behaviors. Identified staff are certified in Non-Violent Crisis Intervention. All staff complete Youth Mental Health Training and annual safety and security training modules to promote a safe and healthy campus. Various clubs and youth programs are encouraged on campus and in the community. Our school's PTA and special area team regularly facilitate programs for family and community involvement. PTA events include Pancakes and Kickball, Casino Night, Boys Night Out, Sweetheart Dance, Pie the Principal, etc. Other events include Donuts with Dad, Boohoo Breakfast, Coffee with Mr. B., Literacy Night, Parent Nights Out, Movies Under the Stars, Spring and Fall kids fishing tournament, Friday Dance-off in café, Forky's Riddle, Sunshine Readers Café, Book Talks with Mr. Bronson, Otters on the Move, iOtters, Slot Car Club, Odyssey of the Mind, Lego Clubs, Girls on the run and more.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00