

Lake County Schools

Cypress Ridge Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Frana

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Lake 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

It is the mission of Cypress Ridge to ensure all of our students acquire the knowledge and skills essential to achieve high levels of success and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a school community we believe in:

Collaborating to support all learners

Celebrating success

Integrating cross-curricular standards with a focus on STEAM

Using evidence to drive instruction

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Voytko, Scott	Principal	Lead school PLC
Schoenthaler, Virginia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Enhance Science curriculum and labs, 4th grade interventionist
Frana, Joe	Assistant Principal	Assist in leading school PLC and curriculum
Caldwell, Christina	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist, MTSS Coordinator
Forsyth, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, .5 teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/12/2021, Joseph Frana

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	90	106	93	102	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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 8/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	85	74	93	69	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	11	3	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	

2020-21 - 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	85	74	93	69	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	11	3	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				88%	58%	57%	86%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				75%	57%	58%	64%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	49%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				82%	60%	63%	82%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	56%	62%	65%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	39%	51%	46%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				79%	54%	53%	79%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	84%	60%	24%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	92%	60%	32%	58%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	59%	31%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	82%	61%	21%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Iready and FSA were used to complete this chart.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	73	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	66	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	68	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	53	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	86	90
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	60	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	64	73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65	51	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	66	73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	67	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	54	25		49	25	8	38				
BLK	72			72							
HSP	84	71		75	43		79				
MUL	78			78							
WHT	86	54	50	81	54	27	76				
FRL	73	50		68	50		62				
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	60	71	63	47	50	32	30				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	83	79		78	57						
HSP	79	82		72	55						
MUL	92	70		77	50						
WHT	91	72	75	85	67	30	85				
FRL	81	71	87	76	56	50	75				
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	48	42	33	47	35	36					
ASN	90			90							
BLK	86	64		77	64						
HSP	69	71		69	57						
MUL	68	57		74	64						
WHT	90	63	48	85	65	41	82				
FRL	77	70	57	72	63	53	67				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We had a learning loss in 2019-2020, showing in 2021. We had a decline in math scores in 4th and 5th grade, and lower learning gains in 5th grade ELA and Math compared to previous years. We continued the trend of not keeping up with 3rd grade proficiency in 4th and 5th grade.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Lower quartile math and ELA

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Tutoring and stronger MTSS plan. If we focus on questions 3 and 4 in our PLC Teams, we will have more kids meeting gains. Since we did not have a system in place in 2018-2019 for supporting students to higher levels of learning, many students didn't perform like they score in previous years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd grade ELA and math

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

PLC Team planning interventions and enrichments effectively

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Stronger MTSS Plan, with a more efficient process for determining who needs more support.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Wonderful Wednesday we will do learning walks to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. Wednesday after-school we will work in our PLC teams.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

More funding for tutoring that will be directed by our MTSS Team. We will have a structured system of response when students don't learn, including having tutoring in the hands of MTSS Team to determine need, instead of a typical FSA tutoring cram in Winter.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Based on FSA Scores from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list Standards-aligned Instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because if students did not hit proficiency targets during independent instruction which resulted in lower than 60% in learning gains and drops in proficiency in ELA, math, and science.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on Tier 1 planning and instruction, we hope to increase learning gains from 58% to 75% in ELA and 49% to 75% in math by end of year.
Monitoring:	We will monitor progress through IReady predicted proficiency/FSA score reports per student to project if students will make gains in Spring FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In PLC we will focus on question 1 and 2 to ensure all teachers understand the purpose, the appropriate guidance and collaborative tasks needed, and the independent work students need to complete. By doing so, we will increase from 50% learning gains to 75%+ learning gains. We will analyze progress every 3 weeks at MTSS Team meetings and formally each quarter at data meetings with the grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement a stronger Tier 1 instructional program planned in PLC Team time we will increase student learning gain scores.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create agendas with team leads for PLC team meetings (also created are norms and goals by team)
2. Coaches and admin will attend PLC team meeting times to support the teams development
3. Walkthroughs performed by admin to provide feedback to instructional models planned during PLC planning time

Person Responsible Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus	Based on I-ready Scores from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list Early Warning Systems is one of our most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because we dropped in ELA and math lower quartile learning gains.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on on this area, we expect to see an increase in LQ learning gains from 20% in math/38% in ELA to 62% in math and ELA.
Monitoring:	MTSS Team Meetings every 3 weeks along with I-ready diagnostics will be utilized to monitor progress towards the goal in increasing the % of LQ students making gains from 20%/32% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A MTSS Team guiding our Intervention Block and School-wide system of supports will be used to increase student learning gains to 62%. To monitor this strategy our MTSS Team will meet with the grade level every 3 weeks to evaluate and redirect the support needed for each student not meeting proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support a daily intervention block and tutoring strategy with an MTSS Team guiding it, then there will be an increase in learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Establish MTSS Team
2. Allocate money for tutoring
3. Schedule Intervention blocks for all grades/contents
4. Monitor Intervention success every 3 weeks in MTSS meetings
5. Check progress/prediction every diagnostic.
6. Assign Teachers on MTSS team to Tier 2/3 interventions as needed within Intervention Block, or through tutoring.

Person Responsible Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	Based on I-ready/FSA scores from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list differentiation is one of our most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because we dropped in ELA and math learning gains.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in learning gains on both I ready Winter diagnostic from year over year averages as well as increases in learning gains to 75%+ from 50% ELA/40% math.
Monitoring:	Our Team created formative assessments and IReady diagnostics as well as our walkthrough tool for classroom observations will be utilized to monitor progress towards goal of increasing learning gains from 40/50 in 2021 to 75% in 2022.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An Intervention /enrichment block will be used to increase our learning gains to 75% making a year's worth of growth or higher . To monitor his strategy formative assessments, I-ready diagnostic data, and walkthrough data will be analyzed every 3 weeks (Iready each quarter).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support An Intervention/Enrichment block, then there will be an increase in learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.Redo the master schedule for efficient use of all TAs and a common intervention block for all grade level teachers.
2. Meet every 3 weeks to determine the System of supports needed for all students not meeting proficiency.
3. Assign teachers to specific groups during intervention block to meet needs of students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

NA

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.

Guidance Counselors do classroom lessons, and any student showing a behavioral/emotional need is discussed and assigned support during MTSS meetings.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Guidance Counselor, ESE Specialist, PASS Teacher and Mental Health Liaison. The GC will hold classroom lessons(including on the news), groups, and check ins- typically behavior. The MHL will handle the emotional issues with students, and will take place up to a few times per week. PASS Teacher will handle our initial steps to support students when they are not successful in Tier 1, and will assign/monitor students that are assigned to GC or MHL.

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: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00