Cypress Lake High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Lake High School

6750 PANTHER LN, Fort Myers, FL 33919

http://cyh.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Angela Roles

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	81%
2020-21 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 (56%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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 Lake High School

6750 PANTHER LN, Fort Myers, FL 33919

http://cyh.leeschools.net/

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)
High School 9-12	No	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

Students graduating from Cypress Lake High School will be independent thinkers and responsible with the skills and knowledge to make quality decisions ensuring future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to succeed in a changing world.

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
Roles, Angela	Principal	
Bond, Candyce	Assistant Principal	
Kurtz, Adam	Assistant Principal	
Turner, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Cole, James	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/10/2021, Angela Roles

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,542

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440	408	368	326	1542
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	78	72	81	307
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	23	7	9	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	67	52	31	160
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	44	46	53	150
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	102	69	80	342
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	131	90	69	396
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	138	94	99	428

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	6	1	2	2	11

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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				52%	55%	56%	52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	49%	51%	45%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	37%	42%	34%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				52%	50%	51%	44%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				53%	45%	48%	40%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	43%	45%	45%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				60%	62%	68%	59%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				72%	67%	73%	70%	66%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	56%	1%	67%	-10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	69%	64%	5%	70%	-1%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	50%	8%	57%	1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	137/45.4	143/42.8	142/41.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/10.8	6/14.3	5/12.2
	English Language Learners	4/13.3	3/8.1	5/13.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/23.6	56/31.6	42/242.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/3.7	3/9.1	2/6.5
	English Language Learners	1/100	0/0	1/100
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	153/85.5	177/91.2	166/85.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6/75	8/88.9	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	1/100	2/66.7	2/66.7
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/51.8	73/42.2	87/50.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/13	2/8	5/22.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/38.4	34/29.3	43/37.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/8	3/10	5/16.7
	English Language Learners	2/22.2	2/18.2	3/33.3
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/24.7	65/48.5	51/39.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.5	10/37	5/18.5
	English Language Learners	3/13	14/38.9	16/48.5
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/75	2/50	2/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/66.7	1/33.3	1/25
	English Language Learners	1/100	0/0	0/0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0	3/4.8	2/3.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	2/33.3	4/57.1	3/37.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/33.3	4/57.1	3/37.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/40	2/33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	139/51.7	178/64	170/63.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/19.2	11/36.7	8/29.6
	English Language Learners	3/8.8	6/15.8	11/26.8

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/33.3	4/57.1	3/37.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/25	1/25	2/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/50

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	21	33	39	19	20	22	22	36		96	26
ELL	11	32	27	29	37	26	32	39		91	33
ASN	67	64									
BLK	29	43	49	27	30	29	38	46		97	36
HSP	42	42	30	44	30	21	57	62		95	52

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
MUL	77	73		67							
WHT	62	48	43	49	24	17	57	73		97	65
FRL	40	39	35	36	24	18	46	62		94	46

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	26	34	23	17	43	47	37	50		87	24
ELL	18	31	26	22	60	57	24	28		70	57
BLK	26	35	23	29	44	43	30	52		94	25
HSP	48	44	30	44	48	47	57	61		92	46
MUL	39	47		50	50		50			90	
WHT	60	48	28	62	58	72	68	86		93	61
FRL	43	38	23	46	52	51	54	63		91	44

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	15	28	30	17	38	35	26	44		64	38
ELL	9	32	27	27	48	53	17	32		100	29
BLK	25	33	34	20	28	13	26	50		93	36
HSP	41	35	23	32	40	55	41	52		93	61
MUL	39	38		38	55						
WHT	67	55	50	57	44	55	79	85		94	64
FRL	40	39	31	32	37	44	49	59		91	51

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	72
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	54
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	42
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 noticed a decrease in our overall data from the previous year in all tested areas. The pandemic, different instructional models and student and teacher quarantines contributed to a difficult year for all stakeholders.

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

20-21 testing showed that Algebra demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. 55.7% of our students who took the Algebra EOC did not show proficiency. Our ESE students really had a difficult time, where 81.2% tested at levels 1 and 2. Our ELL students scored a level 1 or 2 71.2% of the time. Finally, another group that has the most room for improvement is our Black/African American students. 72.8% of this subgroup were not proficient in Algebra.

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

This school year there was a shift in the academic progression. In the past, level 1 and 2 Freshmen were put into Liberal Arts Math to prepare them further for Algebra. During the 20-21 school year, it was a requirement for all Freshmen to take Algebra if they hadn't in Middle School. Additionally, all of the difficulties that came along with being in school during the COVID pandemic, were certainly a factor.

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

Students were proficient in ELA 51.2% of the time in the 20-21 school. The most impressive data shows our L25 students showing learning gains above the state average at 40%.

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

Teachers were given a common planning period to work through the PLC process. The grade level teams did data tracking, monitored and differentiated instruction based on student assessments of

state standards. The students who were in the lowest 25% were also provided with interventions through reading classes.

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

At CLHS we have PLCs for 9th and 10th grade ELA, Biology, US History, Geometry, and Algebra. The groups follow the continuous improvement process. The School District of Lee County has provided Curriculum Maps, Academic Plans, and the Scope and Sequence for each of these subjects to help identify the first question of the cycle, the "What are we going to learn?" Also, the district has created Exemplars with which we can analyze data based on mastery of standards. This helps our teachers to answer the question, "how are we going to know if they have learned it?". Using these resources helps our teachers to be able to accelerate learning by being able to focus on the last two questions in the continuous improvement cycle.

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.

The teachers at CLHS participate in weekly PLC meetings. Data is collected and shared at the PLC meetings. Goals are set for students and the teachers share best practices based on formative assessments within their PLCs. Monthly "pop in" times are scheduled for teachers to visit other classrooms. During this time, teachers are given the opportunity to observe a strategy that is in place in other classrooms.

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

The School District of Lee County is focused on preparing academic resources for our teachers. This has allowed teachers to spend time analyzing the data and planning for differentiated instruction. This has also allowed us to focus our attention on targeted professional development to meet specific school needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 18.8% of students with disabilities showed proficiency on their math EOCs. They actually had higher rates of proficiency than the district in ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	21% of students with disabilities will show proficiency on their math EOC's
Monitoring:	Students with disabilities will monitor their own performance on STAR with a data tracker. Teachers will monitor each student in their math class through the PLC process and performance on Exemplars and progress monitoring. ESE caseworkers will monitor the performance of each student's grades and school work completion
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Turner (jessicaat@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Flexible Scheduling Progress monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students need extra supports to be successful in school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. District and school leaders will review each student with disabilities to explicitly plan and schedule their individual service delivery models.
2. The ESE Department head and APC will work to provide cooperative teaching schedules to provide extra support for students that need interventions.
3. The ESE Department head and APC will schedule paraprofessionals to provide support for students with disabilities
4. Students whose service delivery includes cooperative teaching or instructional support will be scheduled into a Learning Strategies class, that establishes built in supports for classroom success for students with disabilities.
5. After school tutoring is provided by the district
6.In the PLC cycle, explicit work will be done to track data, share best practices and address intervention needs.
7.School-wide, professional development in understanding and implementing accommodations for students with disabilities will be implemented.
8. The ESE Department and APC will established modified access point standards for students with alternate assessments.

Person Responsible	Jessica Turner (jessicaat@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 21-22 school year, as Algebra students move to Geometry, we need to maintain a focus on all students becoming proficient in the course as well as working more specifically with subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	On the Geometry EOC, 48% of CLHS Geometry students will show proficiency on the end of the year state test.
Monitoring:	Student data from Exemplars and Progress monitoring will be used by the Geometry PLC to provide remediations for students prior to the Geometry EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Turner (jessicaat@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Following the PLC cycle
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs allow educators to improve teaching and learning for students

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will use district academic plans, curriculum guides and scope and sequence to decide the "what do we want students to learn?"
2. Teachers will use district created exemplars to assess students. This will help us determine, "How will we know if they have learned it?"
3. Teachers will work weekly with their group in common planning time to analyze data from exemplars. They will discuss best practices and common mistakes and misconceptions and how to address them.
4. Teachers will identify students that need extra interventions and provide supports
5. They will also identify students who have mastered standards to give them work to extend their learning.

Person Responsible	Jessica Turner (jessicaat@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

There is a decrease in the suspension rate over the past five years. In comparison to 2018, we noticed a decrease within the in school suspensions from 88 to 38 incidents. We are also seeing a decline in our out of school suspensions from 53 to 43 incidents. While we are noticing a decrease in our school data, when compared to all high schools statewide, Cypress Lake High School falls into the high category. The school's PBIS team will meet monthly to discuss the school culture. During these meetings, the team will discuss strategies and ways to increase positive behaviors on the campus. The Student Services department also works closely with the Intervention Specialist to develop strategies when working with students who need extra supports by building relationships with these students and finding ways to motivate them to assimilate to the school's culture and expectations.

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.

CLHS has a PBIS program that rewards students and teachers for their positive contributions to the school culture and environment.

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

Administration - set up expectations for school as whole
Teachers - have expectations for individual classes. Hand out PRIDE referrals and positive postcards
PBS Team - have PBS rewards quarterly, acknowledge teachers monthly

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00