

Lake County Schools

Cypress Ridge Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Cypress Ridge to ensure all of our students acquire the knowledge and learn the essential skills to achieve high levels of success through STEM learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a collaborative team of professionals who are committed to improving their practices in order to create a safe, positive, and innovative learning environment where all students excel inside and outside of the classroom.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frana, Joe	Principal	Administrative Assessments (LEADS) Allocations Academic Awards AM/PM Car Duty Budget Campus Supervision Clubs Collaborative Time for Departments Curriculum Custodians Field Trip Administrator Front Office Fundraiser Approvals Leadership Team Master Schedule Media Contact MTSS/RtI Open House/Orientations Opening/Closing School Personnel Professional Learning Time for Grades Region 3 Learning Walks Room Assignments SAC SAI Scheduling School Messenger SIP Committee Social Media - Facebook, Twitter Substitutes TEAM Evaluations Tutoring
Caldwell, Christina	Assistant Principal	Academic Awards Active Supervision Rosters Before/After School Lunch Duty Campus Supervision Collaborative Time for Departments Curriculum Discipline Facilities/Safety with SRD Fire Evacuation Routes/Drills Food Service Handbooks Health Coordinator Lunch Duty Open House/Orientations Problem Solving Team

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Threat Assessment Team Professional Learning Time for Grades SAC School Safety Coordinator Emergency Plan School's Security Audit SIP Coordinator Teacher Assistants TEAM Evaluations Teacher Quality Retention (TQR) Textbook Manager Testing Coordinator (Backup) Uniforms Website
Schoenthaler, Virginia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Academic Awards AM/PM Car Duty Campus Cleanup Car Tags Lunch Duty Lunch Tables Professional Learning Time for Grades Robotics Science Curriculum SIP Committee STEM Night TEAM Expert Testing Coordinator
Forsyth, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	ELA Curriculum Literacy Nights NEHS Spelling Bee Tropicana Speech

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team is involved in writing the SIP. SAC which includes teachers, parents and business members completes a review of the plan, offers suggestions and gives final approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Data is analyzed on a regular basis with an intervention block built into the master schedule for every grade level. After the data is analyzed intervention/enrichment groups are formed based on specific student needs. These groups are fluid, reviewed and revisions are made every three weeks.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	13	17	11	14	14	11	0	0	0	80	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	2	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	1	2	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	1	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	1	0	0	0	15	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	32	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	32	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	71	47	53	80	50	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				61			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			44		
Math Achievement*	80	55	59	80	46	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				60			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			21		
Science Achievement*	83	52	54	77	52	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		61	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	79			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	68			
HSP	67			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	71			80			83					
SWD	28			34							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			71							2	
HSP	70			81			96				4	
MUL	73			87							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			81			79				4	
FRL	66			68			77				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	80	61	55	80	60	54	77					
SWD	51	56	30	54	50		50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	78	62		78	54							
HSP	78	56	40	86	70		71					
MUL	83	79		61	57							
PAC												
WHT	80	59	65	79	58	46	83					
FRL	71	54	36	78	76		43					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	83	61	44	79	51	21	75					
SWD	54	25		49	25	8	38					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	72			72								
HSP	84	71		75	43		79					
MUL	78			78								
PAC												
WHT	86	54	50	81	54	27	76					
FRL	73	50		68	50		62					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	62%	23%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	86%	55%	31%	55%	31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	83%	52%	31%	51%	32%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performing area was 5th grade ELA with 71% proficient. Last year our 5th grade team piloted a co-teaching model with one teacher teaching 1/2 a day and being ILS 1/2 the day. The other teacher teaching 1/2 the day and being a new teacher coach. This lead to teaching inconsistencies throughout the year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Grade 4 math had the largest decrease from 90% to 76%. One factor could be two veteran teachers left the school and one of the replacements was a first year teacher. Another factor could be the new curriculum that was adopted by the district.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All of our scores were significantly higher then the district and state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Grade 5 math had the most improvement from 67%-86%. Fifth grade had been using their intervention time for ELA. After analyzing midyear data the intervention block time became dedicated to math. From October of last school year until the end of the year our dedicated Intervention time focused on Math. Our Math Coach was involved in providing support, strategies and assisted with working with students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is the number of students with 10% or more absences. A second area of concern is the number of students who have two or more EWS.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Providing the necessary support in ELA, Math and intervention block to our third grade team consisting of six teachers, five of those being new to our school.
2. Addressing the number of students with 10% or more absences.
3. Improving proficiency levels in all tested areas.
4. Providing support and mentorship for our first through third year teachers.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We currently have thirteen instructional personnel who are new to Cypress Ridge. This is a significant number for our school as staff turnover is usually low.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To retain the teachers we have recruited as well as our veteran teachers.

Monitoring:

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

First and second year teachers will have bimonthly meetings with a qualified mentor. All other teachers new to Cypress Ridge will be assigned a buddy mentor. Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct bimonthly check-ins with all teachers new to Cypress Ridge as well as teachers in their third year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Providing first and second year teachers with qualified mentors is research based.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are committed to doing everything in our power including an evidence based mentoring program to retain our instructional personnel.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Bi-monthly meetings between mentor and mentee
2. Principal and Assistant Principal bi-monthly meetings with all teachers in their first three years of teaching.

Person Responsible: Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Three of the seven state assessments dropped in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All seven state assessment results will show an increase in proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through our fluid current school wide MTSS process. Every three weeks grade levels meet to form intervention and enrichment groups based upon the most recent data analyzed. Data collected from state assessments, district assessments and standard assessments will also be used to identify and support students who are in jeopardy of not demonstrating proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A variety of district Tier 2 and Tier 3 approved programs are used based upon student needs. Some examples are SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Read Naturally and i-Ready.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Selections were made based on recommendations by district specialists, our school based leadership team and research by John Hattie. According to John Hattie (Visible Learning For Teachers Maximizing Impact on Learning) early intervention has an effect size of .47.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Ongoing data analysis to ensure learning gains are achieved and students needing additional support are identified on a regular basis.
2. MTSS meetings will be conducted with grade levels every three weeks.
3. Quarterly data chats provide another opportunity to identify students in need of additional support.
4. Provide before and after school tutoring for lowest quartile students. Tutoring will be provided by Highly Effective teachers.

Person Responsible: Christina Caldwell (caldwellc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				\$2,552.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	1930	0597 - Cypress Ridge Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,552.00
			Notes: 4. Provide before and after school tutoring for lowest quartile students. Tutoring will be provided by Highly Effective teachers.			
Total:						\$2,552.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No