Broward County Public Schools

Cypress Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Cypress Elementary School

851 SW 3RD AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Vanessa Schnur

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

| 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) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Γitle I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Last Modified: 4/10/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 23

Cypress Elementary School

851 SW 3RD AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvan | 2 Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 96% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | С | | В | В |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Cypress Elementary is dedicated to meeting the educational needs of all students in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary is committed to educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Schnur, Vanessa | Principal | Mrs. Schnur is the school's instructional leader. She monitors student achievement and teacher performance through formal and informal classroom observations and individual meetings with students and teachers to review data. She provides regular updates and is an active participant of all school functions. |
| Dunbar- Creary, Claudine | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Dubar-Creary assists with monitoring and the implementation of the school's instructional structure. She facilitates and monitors student discipline. Mrs. Dunbar-Creary also assists with classroom walkthroughs/ observations and provides feedback to teachers and students. She uses data to monitor and assess needs of students and teachers. |
| Aversa, Sandra | Math Coach | Ms. Aversa provides supportive services in the area of mathematics as needed to improve academic performance. She conducts classroom wall-through to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents, and all stakeholders. |
| Bray, Jacquelyn | Instructional Coach | Intermediate Literacy- Ms. Bray provides supportive services in the area of English Language Arts (ELA) as needed to improve academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-throughs to provide ongoing feedback to teachers and students. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents, and all stakeholders. She's also the SAC Chair. |
| Peters, Heather | Other | ESE Specialist - Ms. Oken coordinates our CPST Meetings and serves as out RTI Contacts. She ensures that we are in compliance with IEPs and EPs. She supports our ESE teachers and students. She also collaborates with teachers to make ensure that our ESE population are receiving the necessary instructional exposure to make growth in academics. She is apart of the Support Team and works collaboratively with the team to make schoolwide decisions. |
| Patrick, Kimberlia | Science Coach | Ms. Patrick provides support services in the area of science. She provides professional development in the area of science and conducts classroomwalkthroughs to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She monitors the use of science programs in K-5 classrooms. |
| Rucker, Cathy | Instructional Coach | Primary Literacy Coach - Ms. Rucker provides supportive services in the area of English Language Arts (ELA). She conducts classroom walk-throughs to provide ongoing feedback to teachers. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents, and all stakeholders. |
| Spiteri, Fabiana | Instructional Coach | ELL Coordinator- Ms. Spiteri provides supportive services to our English Language Learners (ELL) as needed to improve their academic performance. She conducts classroom walk-through to provide ongoing feedback to |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | teachers. She works closely with the faculty, staff, parents and all stake holders. |
| Knight, Brittany | Other | Ms. Knight works in ensuring that ASD students needs are being met. She is a member of the Support Team and works with the team to help make decisions for the school. |
| Gordon, Jenelle | School Counselor | Ms. Gordon works diligently with all teachers and staff to provide counseling and emotional and social support to our students as well as training to our staff. She is part of our CPST and she's also our RTI contact. Ms. Gordon is a member of the Support Team and works with the team to help make decisions for the school. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Vanessa Schnur

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.

3

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.

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

5

Total number of students enrolled at the school

740

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

6

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 | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 123 | 117 | 117 | 107 | 104 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 669 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 61 | 48 | 27 | 23 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 43 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 47 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 37 | 53 | 58 | 28 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 |

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 | | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| 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

Tuesday 10/4/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | de L | _ev | el | | | | | | Total |
|--|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 96 | 122 | 85 | 120 | 94 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 615 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 45 | 49 | 34 | 39 | 38 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 24 | 42 | 13 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 16 | 24 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 13 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | de L | _ev | el | | | | | | Total |
|--|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 96 | 122 | 85 | 120 | 94 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 615 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 45 | 49 | 34 | 39 | 38 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 24 | 42 | 13 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | G | rade | Le | ve | ı | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|------|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 16 | 24 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 13 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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).

| Sahaal Grada Component | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | 2019 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 37% | 58% | 56% | | | | 42% | 59% | 57% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 59% | 60% | 58% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | | | | 63% | 54% | 53% | |
| Math Achievement | 41% | 54% | 50% | | | | 60% | 65% | 63% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 65% | | | | | | 71% | 66% | 62% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | | | | | | 60% | 53% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | 42% | 59% | 59% | | | | 36% | 46% | 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 Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 60% | -28% | 58% | -26% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 62% | -20% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -32% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| | ELA | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 59% | -21% | 56% | -18% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -42% | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | MATH | I | | |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 65% | -13% | 62% | -10% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 67% | -17% | 64% | -14% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 60% | 1% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -50% | | | • | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 53% | -22% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | | | |

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 | 18 | 48 | 43 | 20 | 55 | 55 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 54 | 57 | 39 | 68 | 61 | 38 | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 58 | 35 | 33 | 59 | 50 | 45 | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 54 | 63 | 43 | 69 | 64 | 36 | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 54 | 43 | 42 | 62 | 50 | 40 | | | | | |

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | 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 | 8 | 17 | 21 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 38 | 33 | 25 | 18 | | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 33 | 18 | 21 | 8 | | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 36 | 43 | 29 | 23 | | 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 30 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 37 | 32 | 25 | 15 | 5 | 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 15 | 59 | 54 | 29 | 58 | 53 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 58 | 69 | 64 | 70 | 68 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 53 | 50 | 54 | 74 | 57 | 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 61 | 70 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 64 | | 67 | 90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 56 | 60 | 60 | 70 | 58 | 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 404 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |

| English Language Learners | | |
|--|-----|--|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |
| Native American Students | | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |
| Asian Students | | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |
| Black/African American Students | | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |
| Hispanic Students | | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |
| Multiracial Students | | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | |
| 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 | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | | |
|--|----|--|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 48 | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | |
| 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?

Trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas include lack of reading comprehension and mathematics proficiency. Based on 2022 data, only 37% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA and 41% of students were proficient in Math.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the greatest need for improvement is in Mathematics Measurement and Geometry. Improvements are also necessary in ELA Key Ideas and Details and Integration of Knowledge.

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

The contributing factors for this need for improvement is the lack of foundational skills. Implementation of new evidence based intervention programs, that will address deficiencies and foundational skills. In additional, early identification of struggling students. Professional development geared towards effective implementation of Benchmark Advance Curriculum and Envision math materials.

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

Based on 2022 data, Math learning gains in the lowest quartile improved by 54 points and learning gains in math improved by 49 points.

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

Continued use of Acaletics, which was initiated in 2019 and it continued in 2022. It consisted of front loading and reviewing of standards. Students were rewarded for making gains monthly. Continued use of Reflex and Frax to build fluency. Small group reteach and interventions was used as needed with low 25. Calendar Math was used as a focus in primary grades K-3. Calendar math front loaded and reviewed math standards. Ongoing progress monitoring and formative assessments were helpful with knowing exactly students needs and strengths. Pull out small groups by ESSER teacher. ELO opportunities, after school and on Saturdays.

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

We will continue with Acaletics and the implementation of Mountain Math and Success Maker. Strategies to accelerate learning include the use of small group instruction within the classroom. Also, our school has an ESSER teacher that instructs specific students on math content and strategies necessary to increase their academic achievement. Extended Learning Opportunities such as After School Tutoring and Saturday Camp will also be available to accelerate learning.

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 opportunities are provided through our school-based PD calendar titled Curriculum Thursdays. The time is allotted to train instructional personnel on the various programs, strategies, standards, and content specific to curriculum areas. Instructional staff also has access to district provided professional development that focuses on new curriculum initiatives.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement include data analysis and data conversations with administrative personnel, support services, instructional staff, and students. Funding of Extended Learning Opportunities will also ensure that students are provided access to the resources and instruction necessary to continue closing the achievement gap.

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 ELA

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data

This action plan will ensure increase in student achievement in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2023, Cypress Elementary School will increase ELA Achievement level from 37% to 42% as measured on the 2023 FAST PM 3.

Monitoring:

reviewed.

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

We will use Benchmark Advance unit assessments, PM1 and PM2 diagnostic data, and Classroom Walkthroughs to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Schnur (vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

strategy.

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. We will use a student centered approach to instruction, through small groups and differentiation to meet individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this

Targeted small group instruction integrating various modalities of literacy instruction, which are aimed at guiding students towards proficient and lifelong reading. Teachers will use explicit skill instruction by the use of Benchmark Advance components. through the targeted instruction teachers will have the opportunity to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs.

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.

PLCs will be enhanced to improve teaching and learning in reading to increase student performance. PLCs will focus on Benchmark Advance components, and BEST standards. During our collaborative Thursdays, teachers will analyze data, plan instruction, and gather appropriate resources aligned to the Florida Standards.

Person Responsible Jacquelyn Bray (jacquelyn.bray@browardschools.com)

The RTI process will be enhanced to ensure all students are provided the appropriate interventions. Teachers and the school Leadership Team will meet biweekly to monitor student progress and make adjustments as necessary. Teachers will receive support from grade level facilitators to ensure that students needs are met.

Person Responsible Heather Peters (heather.oken@browardschools.com)

Staff training will align to student achievement data and teacher need. Professional development will be provided to teachers to improve and support the quality of teaching and learning in order to increase performance. Professional development will focus on literacy. Teachers will attend district training that will support the school's literacy initiative.

Person Responsible Jacquelyn Bray (jacquelyn.bray@browardschools.com)

Classroom walkthoughs by administration, district, staff, and Instructional Coaches allows us to determine if there is proper implementation of the balanced literacy components.

Person Responsible Vanessa Schnur (vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com)

Students will participate in extended learning opportunities. Staff will contact parents and explain the benefits of participating in extended learning opportunities that are offered by the school

Person Responsible Claudine Dunbar-Creary (claudine.dunbar-creary@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This action plan will ensure an increase in ELA achievement in ESE students.

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

Our Federal Index for Students With Disabilities will increase by 5 points.

Monitoring:

outcome.

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

We will use Benchmark Advance unit assessments, PM1 and PM2 diagnostic data, and Classroom Walkthroughs to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Schnur (vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Small group instruction which includes differentiated groups and guided reading groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Targeted small group instruction integrating various modalities of literacy instruction, which are aimed at guiding students towards proficient and lifelong reading. ELA and ESE teachers will use explicit skill instruction and by the use of Benchmark Advance components. Through the targeted instruction teachers will have the opportunity to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs.

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.

Use FAST PM1 and PM2 to determine reading deficiencies.

Person Responsible Jacquelyn Bray (jacquelyn.bray@browardschools.com)

Monitor Benchmark Advance unit assessments.

Person Responsible Cathy Rucker (cathy.rucker@browardschools.com)

Students will participate in extended learning opportunities-ESE Staff will contact parents and explain the benefits of participating in extended learning opportunities that are offered by the school

Person Responsible Heather Peters (heather.oken@browardschools.com)

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

Based on 2021-2022 end of year assessments, 21% of our first grade students were proficient on the end of year district assessment and second grade had 28% proficient. Fifteen percent of incoming first grade students (Kindergarten in 21-22) were proficient based on the BAS assessment. Based on the data reviewed, it directly impacts students' reading proficiency. The challenge at Cypress is our students enter KG, coming in already 2-years below grade level with minimal language skills and knowledge, and lack schooling. Reasons why we must continuously focus now on bettering the students in primary grades to assist them to be more successful once they enter intermediate grades. Students in primary grades are struggling with their foundational skills, having trouble learning to read and building a strong foundation to be better prepared to read to learn once entering 3rd grade. Because we have been identified as a R.A.I.S.E (Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence) school with 50% or more of our students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment (FSA) for us the Focus on foundational skills will help minimize having 50% or more students in grades 3-5 as non-readers when entering the intermediate grades. Looking at our most current PM1 data, 42% of students scored in the RED and an average of 20 students in each grade level needed multiple attempts to pass the practice test in order to begin their actual placement test which supports this academic concern.

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

Based on 2021-2022 statewide assessments, only 37% of students in grades 3-5 performed at level 3 or above on the standardized ELA Assessment (FSA). Based on the data reviewed, it directly impacts students' reading proficiency. Because we have been identified as a R.A.I.S.E (Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence) school with 50% or more of our students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment (FSA) for us the focus on comprehension skills will help minimize students scoring below grade level proficiency.

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)

By the end of the school year 2022-2023, 42% or more of students in grades K-2 will score at or above grade level on statewide standardized ELA Assessment (FAST -Star).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the school year 2022-2023, 42% or more of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above level 3 on statewide standardized ELA Assessment (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.

Desired outcomes will be progress monitored through data analysis from the FAST assessments during PM1 and PM2. This will serve as tool to help provide data-based decisions and instructional implications needed to increase student performance. Additional formative assessment data will be collected from the Benchmark Advance Unit Assessment. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by administration and instructional coaches. Feedback will be given in a timely manner to help improve instructional practices. Data will be reviewed and discussed with both teachers and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Schnur, Vanessa, vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com

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. §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 Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Implementation of evidenced-based practices/programs that align to the district's K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan include: Heggerty (K-2), Reading Horizons (K-3), Leveled Literacy Instruction (K-5), and Benchmark Advance Interventions (K-5). Additionally, implementation of MTSS/Collaborative Problem Solving Framework will ensure students receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction interventions.

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?

The rationale for implementation of selected evidenced-based strategies/practices align to the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and have proven successful for identified need. Heggerty, Reading Horizons, and LLI all support foundational skills related to phonics and phonemic awareness. Benchmark Advance and LLI also support comprehension development, vocabulary, and fluency.

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 |
|--|--|
| Literacy Leadership Team, inclusive of various stakeholders such as teachers, support team, and administration will continue to monitor literacy instruction and data. | Schnur, Vanessa, vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com |
| Continue Team Data Chats/Discussions to progress monitor individual student performance. Benchmark Unit Assessments, FAST, and Star Literacy will all serve as formative monitoring assessments. | Schnur, Vanessa, vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com |
| Continue monthly Curriculum Conversations devoted to discussion and sharing best practices of ELA standards and student performance. | Schnur, Vanessa, vanessa.schnur@browardschools.com |

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.

Our school is committed to ensuring that Cypress Elementary is a welcoming, equitable, and inclusive environment for all stakeholders. Establishing connections and partnerships with students and parents is of paramount importance to ensure that everyone feels valued and supported. Through the use of culturally responsive strategies and materials our teachers are dedicated to making sure that students feel represented, accepted, and respected. We have developed clear expectations and procedures to promote the academic and social emotional development of our students. Our focus on student and staff achievement by creating a motivating and celebratory environment has attributed to our positive school culture and morale.

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

Our stakeholders include our district and school staff, parents, and community members. District and school staff members plan events to promote a positive culture and environment. for example, parent trainings and student showcases. Our school strongly believes in leading by example and being a mentor for students and staff through collaboration and working across grade levels and departments. We maintain student engagement through the daily integration of creative and motivating activities that reflects our high expectations for student achievement. By providing them with opportunities to develop qualities such as empathy, reliability, respect, and kindness has attributed to our positive school culture. Furthermore, our frequent and positive interaction with parents have allowed us to establish meaningful connections with our families. We host a variety of school activities throughout the school year to encourage parent and community involvement. In addition, our relationships with our community partners has been essential to building and sustaining a positive school culture by helping engage our families in community events. As well as help celebrate student achievement through quarterly incentives which allows the students to not only feel celebrated in the school but also valued in the community.