

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cypress Creek Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Cypress Creek Elementary School

4040 19TH AVE NE, Ruskin, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Edgar

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2009

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Cypress Creek Elementary School

4040 19TH AVE NE, Ruskin, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

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	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide quality instruction empowering students to be successful and responsible for their learning in and out of school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a learning community dedicated to the success of every student .

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
Moral, Roy	Principal	Principal, responsible for the running of the school and ensuring student achievement and safety
Bryner, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal in charge of instructional process, assessment and student discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2009, Mary Edgar

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	145	135	145	193	159	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	14	15	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	19	42	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Monday 6/1/2020

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	136	131	138	190	156	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	925
Attendance below 90 percent	26	27	34	30	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	19	30	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	136	131	138	190	156	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	925
Attendance below 90 percent	26	27	34	30	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	19	30	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	45%	52%	57%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	50%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	46%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	54%	63%	42%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	62%	42%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	51%	34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	50%	53%	55%	48%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	54%	-1%	62%	-9%
	2018	39%	55%	-16%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
	2018	38%	57%	-19%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
	2018	26%	54%	-28%	61%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
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	34	41	34	40	67	50	41				
ELL	35	48	46	46	64	50	31				
BLK	42	47	38	54	60	53	44				
HSP	40	50	51	47	60	49	36				
MUL	67	50		67	64						
WHT	52	59	70	58	72		62				
FRL	42	49	50	50	62	55	41				
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	30	36	19	40	47	42	31				
ELL	38	44	40	29	39	39	30				
BLK	38	35	16	31	35	36	30				
HSP	39	43	42	32	36	32	45				
MUL	46	50		42	38		70				
WHT	59	56	40	51	45	30	59				
FRL	41	43	36	33	36	33	42				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	34	47	28	41	29	15				
ELL	25	41	30	33	25	23	30				
BLK	42	46	64	32	41	35	53				
HSP	38	51	39	39	34	31	50				
MUL	62	50		62	53						
WHT	55	48		51	52	38	67				
FRL	38	48	43	36	37	33	48				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
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	46
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	48
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
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	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.

ESSA Performance Index SWD 43. Improved compared to previous years. Need to continue improving to ensure that no subgroup falls below 43.

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

3rd grade ELA dropped 3 points. Despite best efforts, there were several staffing issues at this grade level. The original teacher left on a health leave and subsequent substitute teachers were not up to the task of dealing with the content.

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.

5th grade math had the greatest gap. That group the previous year also struggled when compared to the state. There was, however, a 3 point improvement from the previous year and a 6 point improvement in same grade comparison

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

4th grade math performance up 17 points. Two years of performance scale work and the use of formative assessments to drive instruction paid off.

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

SWD

ELL

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Attendance
4. ELA growth
5. BQ growth

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Continue to incorporate small group instruction based on formative data by class.

Measurable Outcome:

All subgroups will improve on ELA proficiency by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Planning for small group instruction based on formative assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction has been proven to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During preplanning, staff will plan initial weeks instruction.
2. Teachers will assess students
3. Small group Instruction will be developed for individual students

Person Responsible

Andrea Bryner (andrea.bryner@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Continue to plan for small group instruction based on student data.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will increase in math achievement by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning for small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction planned with student data has been shown to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will use preplanning to begin planning for the first few weeks.
2. Teachers will assess the students.
3. Teachers will use data to plan for small group instruction.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

We communicate with parents through daily school agendas, quarterly progress alerts and conferences. Parent link, school website and social media accounts will be used to communicate on a frequent basis. The SAC committee and PTA are ways that stakeholders can participate in impacting the culture and climate of the school.

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