

Orange County Public Schools

Cypress Creek High



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Cypress Creek High

1101 BEAR CROSSING DR, Orlando, FL 32824

<https://cypresscreekhs.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Maricarmen Aponte

Start Date for this Principal: 5/31/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 87% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* Pacific Islander Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (56%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| 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. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Cypress Creek High

1101 BEAR CROSSING DR, Orlando, FL 32824

<https://cypresscreekhs.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| High School 9-12 | No | 87% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 90% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

With the support of families and the community we will foster a whole student approach to learning and lead our students to success as inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring global citizens.

With the support of families in the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Chappetta, Bethany | Assistant Principal | Works on master schedule and with CTE & Counseling staff. |
| Mendez, Marisol | Principal | Runs the school. Manages all personnel and community needs. |
| Beasley, Gale | Assistant Principal | Works with pre-school and social studies. |
| Hoffman, James | Assistant Principal | Works with ESE, Science, and Performing Arts. |
| Wagner, Karl | Assistant Principal | Works with discipline, math, and PE. |
| Zambrano, Angela | Assistant Principal | Works with ELA and Reading. |
| Scanlon, Elizabeth | Instructional Coach | Works with ELA and Reading teachers. |
| Castro, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Math coach |
| Quinones-Santana, Magda | Instructional Coach | Works with science |
| Valente, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | Works with Social Studies and new teachers |
| Root, Caleb | Dean | Works with discipline |
| Colon, Yizzette | Staffing Specialist | Works with ESE and 504 students |
| Reyes, Joann | Staffing Specialist | Works with ESE students |
| Roviaro, Krystin | Graduation Coach | Testing Coordinator & works with SS and Business department |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/31/2022, Maricarmen Aponte

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.*

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

177

Total number of students enrolled at the school

3,435

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

44

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

44

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 827 | 847 | 871 | 804 | 3349 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 386 | 463 | 457 | 1545 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 114 | 127 | 71 | 348 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 49 | 39 | 130 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 77 | 78 | 50 | 230 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 281 | 287 | 0 | 840 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 394 | 318 | 119 | 1104 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 378 | 371 | 176 | 1180 |

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 | 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 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 14 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 805 | 769 | 688 | 661 | 2923 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 236 | 217 | 210 | 839 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 53 | 34 | 28 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 117 | 143 | 112 | 478 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 161 | 191 | 179 | 662 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 201 | 139 | 120 | 608 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 212 | 139 | 88 | 583 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 239 | 212 | 253 | 889 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 274 | 239 | 202 | 916 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 805 | 769 | 688 | 661 | 2923 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 236 | 217 | 210 | 839 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 53 | 34 | 28 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 117 | 143 | 112 | 478 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 161 | 191 | 179 | 662 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 201 | 139 | 120 | 608 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 212 | 139 | 88 | 583 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 239 | 212 | 253 | 889 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 274 | 239 | 202 | 916 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 |

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 | 41% | 49% | 51% | | | | 51% | 55% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 41% | | | | | | 49% | 53% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | | | | | | 43% | 40% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 23% | 36% | 38% | | | | 32% | 43% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 38% | | | | | | 46% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 53% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 31% | 40% | | | | 65% | 70% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 61% | 43% | 48% | | | | 64% | 73% | 73% |

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 |

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

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

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | 67% | -5% | 67% | -5% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | 69% | -7% | 70% | -8% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31% | 63% | -32% | 61% | -30% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31% | 53% | -22% | 57% | -26% |

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 | 14 | 24 | 19 | 10 | 31 | 35 | 19 | 32 | | 97 | 27 |
| ELL | 19 | 32 | 28 | 19 | 36 | 48 | 41 | 40 | | 100 | 64 |
| ASN | 72 | 54 | | 57 | 60 | | 82 | 75 | | 100 | 85 |
| BLK | 43 | 43 | 36 | 21 | 34 | 39 | 59 | 62 | | 99 | 57 |
| HSP | 38 | 39 | 29 | 22 | 38 | 50 | 48 | 58 | | 99 | 66 |
| MUL | 33 | 17 | | | | | | 55 | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 43 | 31 | 29 | 38 | 18 | 64 | 69 | | 99 | 65 |
| FRL | 38 | 40 | 33 | 20 | 34 | 41 | 47 | 58 | | 99 | 67 |
| 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 | 9 | 19 | 23 | 14 | 23 | 28 | 27 | 33 | | 100 | 27 |
| ELL | 18 | 37 | 37 | 19 | 24 | 22 | 35 | 34 | | 100 | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | 100 | 83 |
| ASN | 76 | 65 | | 30 | 9 | | 80 | 78 | | 100 | 87 |
| BLK | 42 | 45 | 42 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 54 | 51 | | 100 | 53 |
| HSP | 41 | 43 | 39 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 53 | 53 | | 99 | 62 |
| MUL | 43 | 50 | | 38 | 25 | | 64 | | | 94 | 73 |
| WHT | 53 | 54 | 48 | 25 | 22 | 18 | 75 | 60 | | 99 | 66 |
| FRL | 42 | 47 | 36 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 52 | 54 | | 99 | 64 |
| 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 | 20 | 38 | 36 | 21 | 41 | 48 | 37 | 40 | | 96 | 31 |
| ELL | 23 | 44 | 47 | 24 | 48 | 61 | 42 | 47 | | 98 | 69 |
| ASN | 79 | 59 | 54 | 62 | 55 | | 84 | 75 | | 100 | 90 |
| BLK | 47 | 48 | 41 | 22 | 38 | 44 | 56 | 66 | | 99 | 62 |
| HSP | 46 | 47 | 43 | 31 | 46 | 55 | 61 | 60 | | 98 | 70 |
| MUL | 69 | 38 | | 10 | | | | 79 | | 100 | 64 |
| WHT | 64 | 54 | 40 | 40 | 47 | 42 | 79 | 71 | | 99 | 70 |
| FRL | 46 | 47 | 39 | 28 | 45 | 53 | 57 | 58 | | 99 | 71 |

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 | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 39 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 536 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| 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% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 42 |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 26 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 50 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| 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?

In analyzing the school data, our students with disabilities (SWD) are not at a proficient level yet. Though we just made our ESSA goal for our ELL students, it's clear we need to focus on both subgroups in order to have all students meet proficiency or increase our learning gains with our lowest 25% on the exams.

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

As a school, we need to focus on seeing greater improvements in math. While our 2021-2022 focus on math saw an increase in proficiency and learning gains, only 23% met proficiency and 38% had learning gains. In ELA, we saw dips in all categories, with a decrease of 4% in proficiency and 5% in learning gains, and 10% in our lowest 25%.

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

Attendance was a huge issue last year, with students still trying to do their classes from home. In math and in English, we had multiple teacher vacancies throughout the year which contributed to lower

achievement levels and learning gains. This year we will focus on teacher retention through building culture and establishing community within the school. For students, we will monitor attendance and address tardies.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, we saw improvement in our math scores, where our learning gains improved by 17% and our lowest 25% learning gains improved by 23%. US History also improved in proficiency by 6%.

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

Last year, we increased the number of tutors in our math classrooms to assist with our teacher shortage. We also held regular data chats and professional learning opportunities for our teachers. Our struggling teachers received side-by-side coaching from our instructional coaches.

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

This year we added an additional instructional coach to assist our science department. We also hired interventionists to push in to our ELA, Math, Biology, and US History classes. We will be meeting with our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) twice a week to discuss data, common assessments, lesson planning, and instructional strategies for student interventions and enrichment.

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.

Twice a month we will have Professional Development (PD) opportunities for our teachers. PD will be designed based on teacher needs, data, district expectations, and new state standards. Our professional learning is differentiated at times to scaffold for new and experienced teachers.

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

We will offer peer tutoring, Saturday enrichment/intervention opportunities, and teacher-led after school remediation. Teachers will be given trainings on instructional strategies to grow achievement across our subgroups. As a school, we are committed to establishing common values to create a safe and supportive learning environment at Cypress Creek High School.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.**

Based on our 2021-2022 school data, only 31% of SWD met the state ESSA goal in state assessments.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 42% of SWD will meet proficiency levels on state assessments.

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through Progress Monitoring Assessments, formative classroom common assessments, and a regular evaluation of classroom-based accommodations for SWD.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

James Hoffman (james.hoffman@ocps.net)

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

SWD are regularly supported and monitored by our Staffing Specialist and Learning Strategies teachers. Teachers are provided with ESE accommodations for their students and receive regular professional development in how to apply those accommodations in the classroom. This year, we will provide professional development on engagement strategies to enhance classroom learning and cognitive engagement from all students. As a school, we will be focusing on Identifying Critical Content as a Deliberate Practice element.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific strategy.
Describe the
resources/criteria
used for selecting
this strategy.**

When teachers are equipped with proper engagement strategies and best practices, they feel more confident in developing lessons which aim to enhance learning through meaningful activities. Through learning about how to identify the critical content, students can focus on learning the content instead of being distracted by additional information. This year we hired a new Staffing Specialist who will be offering professional development on how to use accommodations.

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.

- Subgroup training for all teachers
- Training PLCs to work with subgroup data
- Culturally Responsive training for all teachers
- Assistant Principals attending ESE training with the district
- School-wide Deliberate Practice element of Identifying Critical Content

Person Responsible Joann Reyes (joann.reyesojea@ocps.net)

#2. 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 reviewed.

During the 2021-2022 school year, only 41% of student were proficient on the FSA ELA. This was a 4% decrease from the previous year. In learning gains, we decreased 5% from the 20-21 school year to the 21-22 school year (46% to 41%). Our bottom quartile saw a 10% decrease from 20-21 to 21-22 (40% to 30%).
 Our goal is to improve student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on an annual analysis of the postsecondary feedback report data.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, our goal is increase proficiency from 41% to 47%. We will increase our learning gains from 41% to 47%. Our bottom quartile will increase from 30% to 41%.

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

We will monitor this through Progress Monitoring Assessments, common assessments, and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Scanlon (elizabeth.scanlon@ocps.net)

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

As a school, we will focus on identifying critical content in the classroom. With new standards, teachers will be attending professional learning throughout the year in order to learn best practices for the new content. professional learning communities will focus on literacy strategies within the classroom, including elements of close reading and student data conferences.

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

Close reading strategies, such as annotation, serve students in all content areas as they process critical content. Student learning will be shared and documented through data collection and student led conferencing.

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.

- ELA teachers received comprehensive professional development on the new standards
- Teacher leads will attend district IMPACT training
- Professional Learning Communities will meet twice a week to discuss data and instructional strategies

Person Responsible

Angela Zambrano (angela.zambrano@ocps.net)

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.

This year, we have embraced a new set of Core Values that we are using to drive decision-making on our campus. Students and staff are learning that our CLAWS (core values) embrace Collaboration, Leadership, Academic Excellence, Whole Person, & Strengths Minded focus. Throughout the year, we will have regular staff fellowship activities to drive partnership, teamwork, and positive culture. We are empowering our students to connect to the campus with leadership opportunities.

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

Members of our staff are collaborating on three teams: Positive Culture, Academic Excellence, and School Spirit. Krystin Roviario (Testing Coordinator) and Regan Stapleton (SGA teacher) are leading the School Spirit team. Magda Quinones (Science Coach) and Rebecca Valente (Instructional Coach) are leading the Academic Excellence team. Caleb Root (Dean) and Erin Stutz (Dean) are leading the Positive Culture team. Within each team are administrators, teacher and student leaders, and community members.