

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cypress Creek 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

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: 1/1/2009

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* 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%)
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 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	78%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moral, Roy	Principal	Running of the school and ensuring the safety and academic achievement of the students.
Edgar, Becky	Assistant Principal	Running of the school and ensuring the safety and academic achievement of the students.
Stinton, Jillian	Instructional Coach	Support and assist the teachers and students in the area of reading
Kelly, Kristine	Instructional Coach	Support and assist the teachers and students in the area of reading

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/1/2009, 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.*

2

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

849

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

3

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

5

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	139	107	144	143	133	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	847
Attendance below 90 percent	56	43	45	47	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				45%	52%	57%	43%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	35%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	54%	63%	37%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	57%	62%	38%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	46%	51%	32%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	50%	53%	46%	51%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
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 Reading and Mathematics is a CAI and diagnostic tool used at all grade levels.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	27	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	27	51
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	42	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	22	34
	Students With Disabilities	8	23	30
	English Language Learners	0	23	14

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	43	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	27	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	30
	English Language Learners	6	16	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	42	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	24	23
	Students With Disabilities	8	23	34
	English Language Learners	0	23	40
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	41	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	46	38
	Students With Disabilities	19	47	38
	English Language Learners	9	64	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	38	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	49	17
	Students With Disabilities	15	38	14
	English Language Learners	15	75	17

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	44	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	37	20
	Students With Disabilities	18	44	9
	English Language Learners	0	.1	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	32	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	32	15
	Students With Disabilities	14	15	17
	English Language Learners	0	17	27
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	60	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	43	41
	Students With Disabilities	8	19	22
	English Language Learners	0	10	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	47	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	26	10
	Students With Disabilities	14	71	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41.25	59	38
	Economically Disadvantaged		43	24
	Students With Disabilities		61	18
	English Language Learners		4	6

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	25	38	40	29	32	29	20				
ELL	37	50	38	36	38	40	20				
BLK	39	51	58	39	40		40				
HSP	37	39	27	37	34	29	28				
MUL	29			50							
WHT	52	68		57	44		60				
FRL	38	46	42	39	36	32	32				
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				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	37
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	
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	45
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	56
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

On state assessments all subgroups dropped in achievement. i-Ready data is lower than previous years across grade levels and subgroups as well.

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

All subgroups need to improve. In order to address such a large group the school will focus on ensuring all students make sufficient growth in i-Ready and FSA.

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

eLearning was not successful for this population and quarantines decreased time in the classroom for a significant population in the school.

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

NA

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

Data showed a drop across the board.

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

Standards based learning and deep data dives in formative assessments will drive the curriculum delivery in all grade levels.

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.

Professional development in lesson planning and new curriculum is ongoing. PD on accelerating versus remediation is also being delivered at planning meetings and PLCs

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

Resource content area teachers will be working directly with students from the beginning of the year as well as providing supports for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Students achievement in ELA dropped significantly.

Measurable Outcome: 100 % of students will achieve a year's growth in ELA as measured by the FSA.

Monitoring: Ongoing monthly formative assessments and quarterly district provided assessments will be used to determine students growth towards the goal and used in planning to drive the curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Planning and implementing collaborative based structures to strengthen learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to pandemic many teachers stopped using collaborative structures which had helped our students achieve stronger results in previous years. Students in e-Learning last year were at a disadvantage due to the difficulties our families/ staff had in keeping students engaged. In order to ensure that students are highly engaged in a rigorous learning experience we are implementing collaborative based structures to strengthen learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Review data from last year and establish a rationale, and buy-in from instructional staff, for the importance of this area of Focus during pre-planning

Person Responsible Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)

Create a list of collaborative strategies that grade level teams can implement.

Person Responsible Becky Edgar (becky.edgar@hcps.net)

Weekly planning sessions in grades 2, 4 and 5 where student discourse and collaborative strategies are explicitly planned.

Person Responsible Jillian Stinton (jillian.stinton@hcps.net)

Weekly planning sessions in grades KG, 1 and 3 where student discourse and collaborative strategies are explicitly planned.

Person Responsible Becky Edgar (becky.edgar@hcps.net)

Monitor walkthrough data to determine the fidelity of using these strategies in the classroom.

Person Responsible Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)

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.

Student population is changing quickly to due to a boom in construction in the area. Although discipline data in previous years shows that most students behave appropriately, there is an uptick in behavior issues from newly enrolling students. Teachers are creating plans at the class level to welcome and acclimate newly enrolled students. The school has been ranked as high risk for violent incidents. The schoolwide behavior plan has been modified to include more positive rewards for prosocial behaviors. Guidance Counselors are working individually with students struggling to practice more appropriate behavior.

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.

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.

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

Parents are invited to participate in a variety of activities and committees so that their input is gathered. Business partners and charitable organizations help support the school for school wide initiatives.

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
Total:			\$0.00