

Pasco County Schools

Cypress Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jeanne Krapfl

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 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 Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (32%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Pasco 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">67%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">28%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary School is a learning community dedicated to developing resilient, lifelong learners who will work towards reaching their highest potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Krapfl, Jeanne	Principal	Vision, Climate, Instructional Leader
Tonello, Erika	Assistant Principal	Vision, Climate, Instructional Leader, Progress Monitoring

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Jeanne Krapfl

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	100	120	114	119	91	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	20	22	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	4	8	18	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	4	8	18	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	47	48	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	21	11	40	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	9	11	15	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	94	125	117	99	127	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	681
Attendance below 90 percent	19	33	19	24	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	
ELA Course Failures in ELA or Math	3	15	17	21	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 ELA or Math State Assessment	0	0	0	8	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	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	8	19	12	15	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	94	125	117	99	127	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	681
Attendance below 90 percent	19	33	19	24	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	
ELA Course Failures in ELA or Math	3	15	17	21	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 ELA or Math State Assessment	0	0	0	8	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	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	8	19	12	15	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%	52%	56%				57%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	40%						55%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						54%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	46%	50%				56%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	30%						53%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%						38%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	50%	59%				49%	53%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%

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

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	29	37	9	19	24	13				
ELL	19			25							
ASN	45			73							
BLK	33										
HSP	30	27	42	27	31	36	25				
MUL	32	42		29	33						
WHT	38	42	39	28	28	19	28				
FRL	30	35	31	22	29	25	22				
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	13	29	36	13	33	46	11				
ELL	38			44							
ASN	50			67							
BLK	40			20							
HSP	35			36							
MUL	44			50							
WHT	44	41	36	44	39	42	43				
FRL	35	28	33	35	36	39	39				
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	29	54	55	25	49	41	21				
HSP	71	80	70	58	60	55	58				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	55	53	53	54	51	35	47				
FRL	50	56	57	45	50	41	42				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	59
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Reading FSA: 36% of students were proficient, 40% of students made learning gains, 35% of the lowest quartile made learning gains.

Math FSA: 28% of students were proficient, 30% of the students made learning gains, and 25% of the lowest quartile students made learning gains.

Science FCAT: 28% of fifth grade students were proficient

Subgroups below 41%

White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners

Overall FSA data declined from the 2021 testing year.

ELA Achievement decreased from 43% to 36%, a 7% decrease.

ELA Learning Gains increased from 39% to 40%, a 1% increase.

ELA Lowest quartile decreased from 38% to 25%, a 13% decrease.

Math Achievement decreased from 43% to 28%, a 15% decrease.

Math Learning gains decreased from 42% to 28%, a 14% decrease.

Math Lowest quartile decreased from 43% to 25%, an 18% decrease.

Science Achievement decreased from 43% to 28%, a 15% decrease.

Overall, Math and Science had the biggest decrease in proficiency and learning gains. Guiding coalition data indicates a need for student engagement therefore decreasing behaviors and increasing student growth. There were 639 Office Discipline Referrals during the 2021-2022 school year. Walkthroughs indicated that there was a gap in PLC planning to implementation of instruction. During Tier 1 instruction, walkthrough data showed that grade level materials used were not vetted or were below grade level. Guiding coalition data indicates that there was not a tight focus on the 4 guiding questions during PLC.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off the 2021-2022 Math FSA: 28% of students were proficient, 30% of the students made learning gains, and 25% of the lowest quartile students made learning gains. Math demonstrates our greatest need for improvement. Math Achievement decreased from 43% to 28%, a 15% decrease. Math Learning gains decreased from 42% to 28%, a 14% decrease. Math Lowest quartile decreased from 43% to 25%, an 18% decrease.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, our teachers learned the B.E.S.T. Reading standards and a new reading series. Cypress Elementary School had two fifth grade teachers and one fourth grade teacher who resigned and their classrooms were taught by a substitute and instructional assistants. There were gaps in teacher practice in grades 4 and 5. Every teacher in grades 4 and 5 were brand new to Eureka Math. In grades 3-5, we had implementation gaps for Equip, new teachers were still at step 0 with Eureka Math. New actions to address improvement include recruitment efforts and progress monitoring of core assessments. Assessments include: FAST Assessments, Eureka Assessments, HMH Assessments, Lexia, and Zearn. Grade level teachers will need to determine and monitor essential standards in Reading and Math. Teachers will utilize the 8-steps to effective intervention during problem solving time, bi-weekly. Following FAST assessments, progress monitoring data chats will be scheduled for action planning and coaching supports. PLCs will identify students on grade level and above, plan for intentional enrichment instruction and monitor their growth. Buses were late to Cypress Elementary School for much of the year, some times up to two hours late. The same students were missing the same core subjects for hours, days and weeks at a time.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The 2021-2022 FSA data indicated that FSA Reading showed more proficiency and learning gains than FSA Math.

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

The 2021-2022 Reading FSA data showed more proficiency and learning gains than Math due to monthly learning around Reading B.E.S.T. standards during our Early Release Day professional development sessions, and the intentional planning of the reading standards during our professional learning communities. Time was spent intentionally planning for the big idea of the reading module and writing text based evidence.

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

An area of focus will be on student engagement, essential standards aligned to standards-based instruction aligned to the grade level, and delivering and monitoring interventions for growth of all students. The leadership team will create both teacher and student look fors that will show evidence of

implementation and impact for each of the area of focuses. In the area of Math, teachers, curriculum coaches, and administrators will take a deep dive into the BEST Standards with Math and make correlations between the B1GM and the daily tasks. Time will be spent in PLC to study the BEST Standards for Math and Reading so that the teachers have an understanding of the why behind the standards and will be able to make connection during instruction. For all content areas, a focus will be on all tasks being aligned to the grade level benchmark, planning intentional questions aligned to the benchmarks, and connecting and planning for cooperative structures.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the leadership team will attend a cooperative learning structures professional development and will model and coach the teachers on how to utilize the cooperative structures to ensure student engagement. In professional learning communities, teaching teams will utilize the 8-steps to effective intervention during problem solving time, bi-weekly. Following FAST assessments, progress monitoring data chats will be scheduled for action planning and coaching supports. PLCs will identify students on grade level and above, plan for intentional instruction and monitor their growth. During PLCs, coaches and administrators will lead the learning on the BEST standards in Math and Reading with a goal to turn over the facilitation by January 2023 to the PLC facilitators. For all content areas, a focus will be on all tasks being aligned to the grade level benchmark, planning intentional questions aligned to the benchmarks, and connecting and planning for cooperative structures. Additionally, Early Release Day professional development will be developed and given monthly.

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

An action plan for the area of focus will be created with a schedule of check points to monitor our plan. The leadership team will create a note catcher for before, during, and after PLC planning. Coaches will create a schedule to prioritize the coaching of teachers. The action plans will be monitored through the PLC note catchers. District coaches will be invited to PLCs to assist the school based coaches and administrators build capacity of our PLC facilitators and grade level teams.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Data from the 2022 FSA showed that our proficiency rates were 36% for Reading, 28% in Math, and 28% in Science. Overall FSA data declined from the 2021 testing year.
 ELA Achievement decreased from 43% to 36%, a 7% decrease. ELA Learning Gains increased from 39% to 40%, a 1% increase. ELA Lowest 25%ile decreased from 38% to 25%, a 13% decrease.
 Math Achievement decreased from 43% to 28%, a 15% decrease. Math Learning gains decreased from 42% to 28%, a 14% decrease. Math Lowest quartile decreased from 43% to 25%, an 18% decrease.
 Science Achievement decreased from 43% to 28%, a 15% decrease.
 Guiding coalition data indicates a need for student engagement therefore decreasing behaviors and increasing student growth. There were 639 Office Discipline Referrals during the 2021-2022 school year.
 Walkthroughs indicated that there was a gap in PLC planning to implementation of instruction.
 2021-2022 school year had three substitutes teaching intermediate classes for more than a semester: two 5th grade classrooms and one 4th grade classroom.
 2022-2023 school year instructional grade level teachers:
 5th grade: 2 of 4 teachers new to the grade level
 4th grade: 5 of 5 teachers new to the grade level
 3rd grade: 3 of 6 teachers new to the grade level
 2nd grade: 3 of 6 teachers new to the grade level
 1st grade: 1 of 5 teachers new to the grade level
 Kindergarten: 1 of 4 teachers new to the grade level

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

60% of our students will be proficient as measured on the May 2023 FAST.
 100% of students will have an upward trend showing growth as measured from the beginning of year FAST to the end of year FAST.
 100% of our teachers will deliver standards-based aligned instruction.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Using the planning note-catchers from PLCs will be used during walkthroughs to monitor the planning to the implementation stage.
 Teachers will create and/or save exemplar student work samples in order to analyze and determine if rigor was met for the assignment.
 Administration and coaches will conduct walk-throughs and will analyze walk-through data focusing on trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanne Krapfl (jkrapfl@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

PLC work will focus on the 4 guiding questions. Grade level teams will unpack the module for ELA and Math and determine the essential standards. During planning, teachers problem solve for students who do not know the standards and for students who already know the standards. Data collection tools are created and utilized. Teachers use of cooperative structures will be evidenced in walk-through data.

Rationale for Evidence-based

During Tier 1 instruction, walkthrough data showed that grade level materials used were not vetted or were below grade. Guiding coalition data indicates that

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

there was not a tight focus on the 4 guiding questions during PLC. Teachers will use the resources located on the Elementary Learning Network to plan for instruction. Behavior data indicated that there was a need to implement student engagement strategies.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. During PLCs, teachers will work with admin, coaches, and district curriculum specialists to plan lessons that align to the State Benchmarks. This work will be captured on ELA and Math NoteCatcher (Monitored by admin, coaches and PLC facilitators)
2. As a PLC team, teachers will intentionally plan rigorous, standards-aligned questions and tasks for their lessons. This work will be captured on ELA and Math NoteCatcher (Monitored by admin, coaches and PLC facilitators)
3. Cooperative learning structures will be modeled by admin, coaches, and leadership team as we begin to have teachers use them, and intentionally plan for more engaging lessons, with 100% student participation in learning. This structure planning is also included on the NoteCatcher.
4. Using the NoteCatcher and/or lesson plans, admin and coaches will conduct walkthroughs to monitor that the work done in planning is applied to daily classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Jeanne Krapfl (jkrapfl@pasco.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

DIBELS End of Year Data 2022:

K 28% of students were proficient or above based on DIBELS NWF.

1st Grade - 50% of students were proficient or above based on DIBLES.

2nd Grade - 55% of students were proficient or above based on DIBLES.

3rd Grade - 77% students were proficient or above based on DIBLES ORF.

Area of Focus for Engagement: Teachers deliver lessons using collaborative structures that will foster student engagement.

Area of Focus for Essential Standards: Teachers deliver standards-based instruction that is appropriate for the grade level by determining essential standards during PLCs.

Area of Focus for Data Monitoring: Teachers will plan and deliver interventions while monitoring the data in order for all students to have learning gains.

Rational for the Area of Focus: Data from the 2022 FSA showed that our proficiency rates were 36% for Reading. Overall FSA data declined from the 2021 testing year. ELA Achievement decreased from 43% to 36%, a 7% decrease. ELA Learning Gains increased from 39% to 40%, a 1% increase. ELA Lowest 25%ile decreased from 38% to 25%, a 13% decrease.

Teachers will utilize collaborative structures that will foster student engagement.

Determine, instruct, and monitor essential standards in Reading. Multi-sensory activities will be planned for student active learning.

Teachers will engage in collaborative data chats around student data to inform them of next steps.

Teachers will utilize the note catcher for before, during, and after PLC planning.

Teachers will analyze last year's DIBELS data to determine gaps in letter naming fluency and phoneme segmentation fluency and plan interventions using the appropriate DIBELS progress monitoring tools.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

3rd Grade - 77% students were proficient or above based on DIBLES ORF.

Area of Focus for Engagement: Teachers deliver lessons using collaborative structures that will foster student engagement.

Area of Focus for Essential Standards: Teachers deliver standards-based instruction that is appropriate for the grade level by determining essential standards during PLCs.

Area of Focus for Data Monitoring: Teachers will plan and deliver interventions while monitoring the data in order for all students to have learning gains.

Rational for the Area of Focus: Data from the 2022 FSA showed that our proficiency rates were 36% for Reading. Overall FSA data declined from the 2021 testing year. ELA Achievement decreased from 43% to 36%, a 7% decrease. ELA Learning Gains increased from 39% to 40%, a 1% increase. ELA Lowest 25%ile decreased from 38% to 25%, a 13% decrease.

Teachers will utilize collaborative structures that will foster student engagement.

Determine, instruct, and monitor essential standards in Reading.

Teachers will engage in collaborative data chats around student data to inform them of next steps.

Teachers will utilize the note catcher for before, during, and after PLC planning.

Teachers will analyze last year's DIBELS data to determine gaps in oral reading fluency, nonsense word fluency, and word reading fluency and plan interventions using the appropriate DIBELS progress monitoring tools.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using data from last year's DIBELS, teachers will identify areas of fluency growth and use interventions from the ELN specific to the areas identified. Teachers will use DIBELS progress monitoring to monitor growth and effectiveness of these interventions. Students in grades k-2, will increase their end of year benchmark proficiency to 80%.

100% of students will have an upward trend showing growth as measured from the beginning of year FAST to the end of year FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using data from last year's DIBELS, teachers will identify areas of fluency growth and use interventions from the ELN specific to the areas identified. Teachers will use DIBELS progress monitoring to monitor growth and effectiveness of these interventions. Students in grades 3-5, will increase their end of year benchmark proficiency to 80%.

100% of students will have an upward trend showing growth as measured from the beginning of year FAST to the end of year FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

100% of students will have an upward trend showing growth as measured from the beginning of year FAST to the end of year FAST.

Teachers will be able to discuss the intervention provided and the students' response to the intervention.

Collaboration among grade level teachers to share data about their students.

Progress monitor interventions using the 8-steps of effective intervention.

Students are listed by learning target for tier 2.

Students are listed by skills for tier 3.

School-wide collective responsibility for all.

Intervention plans and progress monitoring data is uploaded into Sharepoint.

Teachers will analyze their data to prepare for data chats and problem solving time.

Monitor student engagement through student data and walk throughs.

Teachers will progress monitor the impact and implementation of interventions.

Administration and coaches will utilize the completed note catcher after PLC planning, as a walkthrough tool to capture evidence of implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tonello, Erika, etonello@pasco.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers will intentionally plan for the B.E.S.T. Reading standards. Teachers will utilize the HMH Reading series.

Teachers will come prepared for PLCs.

In PLCs, grade level teams will create CFAs matched to the learning targets of the essential standards to monitor student learning.

We will review the vertical alignment of essential standards to ensure grade rigor.

Teachers will problem solve around students who are not meeting grade level expectations.

Teachers are asking predetermined intentional questions in the class.

Pacing of instruction is on target.

Teachers check for understanding throughout the lesson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Teachers will use the HMH reading series when planning for the standards. HMH has components that address the five areas of reading. Teachers will also use Lexia Core 5 as a supplement to provide reading practice and scaffolding to the students' need. Teachers use vetted resources listed on our Elementary Learning Network.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Grade level PLCs will determine and prioritize the essential benchmarks for each ELA module. Teams will plan and create CFAs and analyze the data. Data will be analyzed by benchmark and learning target. There will be continued professional development around Science of Reading and literacy instruction for both teachers and coaches. Coaches will receive monthly professional development around ELA, which be integrated into the PLCs. The guiding coalition will have a voice in decisions around school wide literacy.</p>	<p>Krapfl, Jeanne, jkrapfl@pasco.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Grade level teams will work collaboratively plan the student work that is expected for that grade level. Completed artifacts (student work samples) are analyzed at a future PLC to ensure grade level rigor has been meet.</p>	<p>Tonello, Erika, etonello@pasco.k12.fl.us</p>

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Cypress staff will work together to develop a stronger collective responsibility of all stakeholders which will build our collaborative culture.
 Each team will create a classroom management system utilizing school-wide expectations.
 Collaborative structures training and resources will be utilized to increase student engagement in every classroom.
 Monthly collaborative structures will be modeled by administrators, coaches, and the school leadership team.
 A safe place/self-regulation location will be created in each classroom and/or team.
 The behavior intervention team will utilize Mind Up, Second Step, district created SEL standards in order to teach students how to self-regulate.
 Staff appreciation and celebrations will be ongoing.
 School wide, grade level, and classroom events for student recognition will be planned and implemented.

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

Jeanne Krapfl - Principal and Erika Tonello - Assistant Principal, plan calendar of events to celebrate staff and students.
 Parent Involvement Coordinator - Assist parents with strategies on how to help their child at home.
 School Leadership Team - Collaborate with administration to plan celebration and recognition.
 Behavior Intervention Team - Support students and staff with strategies for self-regulation.