
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cypress Lake High School

6750 PANTHER LN, Fort Myers, FL 33919

<http://cyh.leeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Students graduating from Cypress Lake High School will be independent thinkers and responsible with the skills and knowledge to make quality decisions ensuring future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to succeed in a changing world.

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
Roles, Angela	Principal	
Bond, Candyce	Assistant Principal	
Robinson, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Farrell, Liam	Assistant Principal	
Kurtz, Adam	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

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.

Our process for involving all stakeholders includes our School Advisory Council Team. The leadership team will share the school data and the School Advisory Council. Together, we will collaborate to revise and refine the School Improvement Plan goals. Focus will be placed on the goals' alignment to the needs of the students during the 2023-2024 school year.

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))

The School Improvement Plan will be revisited after each progress monitoring window to reassess the effectiveness of our plan in closing gaps in student learning. We will pay particular attention to our 9th and 10th grade cohorts as they participate in state progress monitoring. We will also utilize PLCs,

guiding them in data analysis and instructional planning as they ensure that their work supports School Improvement Plan goals. Teachers of tested subjects will have shared planning time to monitor progress toward School Improvement Plan goals. Leading and Learning teams will meet with the department AP for updates and review the most recent meeting prior to their next PLC. Leading and Learning teachers will then share information learned at district trainings during their PLC time to facilitate lesson planning based on students' progress monitoring achievement. Instructional pacing guides will be monitored through administrator walkthroughs, PLC discussions, and formative assessments data analysis in order to ensure that classroom instruction is aligned to state standards and School Improvement Plan goals. The FY24 School Improvement Plan Review Process will also be supported at the district level as we meet to assess and adjust each quarter. Quarter 1, we will review the School Improvement Plan as a school leadership team and assess and adjust the effectiveness and alignment of our plan. Quarter 2, we will participate in our District Data Chat and consider our systems, interventions, and process for monitoring the effectiveness of our plan. Quarter 3, we will once again review our School Improvement Plan as a school leadership team, assessing and adjusting the plan as needed.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	81%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	717
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	492

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	35	47	50	51	49	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				46			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			40		
Math Achievement*	32	34	38	34	33	38	44		
Math Learning Gains				37			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			23		
Science Achievement*	48	54	64	58	35	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	58	66	71	40	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	91	84	89	96	49	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	68	65	65	71	60	67	55		
ELP Progress	37	36	45	47			35		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	91

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	585
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

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	34	Yes	4	
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	48			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	41			
HSP	50			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	47			

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	35			32			48	67		91	68	37
SWD	16			12			21	33		30	7	27
ELL	10			11			24	26		41	7	37
AMI												
ASN								80			1	
BLK	25			17			27	40		45	7	43
HSP	26			27			44	59		69	7	32
MUL	33			35			42	91		80	6	
PAC												
WHT	47			41			58	78		71	7	55
FRL	26			24			38	59		63	7	41

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	51	46	34	34	37	40	58	71		96	71	47
SWD	21	40	34	8	26	33	20	35		89	28	17
ELL	18	35	33	25	42	44	39	27		90	55	47
AMI												
ASN	64	58										
BLK	29	34	27	17	33	38	38	54		98	49	38
HSP	46	43	32	30	37	45	51	56		94	68	48
MUL	61	50		39	20		58					
PAC												
WHT	62	51	46	43	39	33	70	81		97	79	
FRL	38	36	32	27	33	38	48	62		95	64	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	51	46	40	44	29	23	56	68		96	55	35
SWD	21	33	39	19	20	22	22	36		96	26	
ELL	11	32	27	29	37	26	32	39		91	33	35
AMI												
ASN	67	64										
BLK	29	43	49	27	30	29	38	46		97	36	15
HSP	42	42	30	44	30	21	57	62		95	52	36
MUL	77	73		67								
PAC												
WHT	62	48	43	49	24	17	57	73		97	65	
FRL	40	39	35	36	24	18	46	62		94	46	27

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
10	2023 - Spring	51%	45%	6%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	48%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	39%	-26%	50%	-37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	43%	-2%	48%	-7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	63%	-21%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	54%	6%	63%	-3%

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.

Math Achievement showed the lowest performance despite a two percentage point gain in the 22-23 school year. Between SY 21-22 and SY 22-23, there was a two point increase in performance from 34% to 36%. Our increase in performance can be attributed to our new math coach, who was available for interventions and classroom support during the second half of the school year. In Geometry, we hired an experienced, proficient teacher who contributed to our growth.

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

Science Achievement was the greatest decline from the prior year to the SY 22-23 school year. Between SY21-22 and SY 22-23 there was a 9 point decline from 58% to 49%. Some contributing factors included teacher attendance and turnover in the Science Department. Furthermore, the Science progression shifted to include lower performing freshmen who, in the past, would have had a year to adjust to high school and receive academic interventions prior to Biology and its subsequent End of Course Exam. Students in this cohort were scheduled into Biology instead of Environmental Science.

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.

Our biggest gap between the state average and our school's performance data was in Algebra 1. The state's average was 32% proficient, and our school was 13% proficient. That is a difference of 19%. The factors that contributed to this gap were teacher turnover that resulted in the transition of one of our support staff into the classroom after Quarter 1. While our school saw growth in Math overall, this growth was due to our increased performance in Geometry in SY 22-23, which was great enough to offset our Algebra 1 performance.

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

Our English Language Arts performance showed the most improvement from SY 21-22 to SY 22-23. The average for SY 21-22 was 51%, and the average for SY 22-23 was 55%. This is a four percent increase. To facilitate our growth teachers were scheduled into common planning periods in both the English and Reading departments. Additionally teachers, department chairs, and administrators engaged in data tracking and individual data chats. Data chats happened between staff members and between teacher and student. Furthermore, the teachers tracked student achievement, identifying specific standards and providing differentiated spiral reviews of areas of need. The Literacy Coach met regularly with these teachers and provided push-in support as needed to model lessons and provide interventions. Administrative walkthroughs and PLC discussions monitored classroom pacing and the use of instructional guides.

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

One of our primary areas of concern is that 32% of the freshmen in SY 22-23 were absent over 10% of the school days last year.

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

1. Use cross curricular literacy strategies to improve achievement in ELA, Science and Social Studies. Implementing a Literacy team will support the development and execution of literacy based instruction across the curriculum.
2. Continue improvement in math through increasing achievement in Algebra and maintaining Geometry achievement.
3. Decreasing the number of failures in our 9th grade cohort.
4. Decreasing the number of students with attendance below 90%, providing interventions for chronically absent students.

5. Limit the amount of out-of-school suspensions to increase student time in class so that learning continues with positive outcomes for all students.

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 Other**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.

One area of focus for our school for SY 23-24 is culture and environment because we were identified as an ATSI school due to the achievement of our Students with Disabilities. We want to build and support a culture of learning at our school for all students, including Students with Disabilities. The primary rationale for high-quality attendance data is the relationship between student attendance and student achievement, which supports a schoolwide culture of learning. Students who attend school regularly are shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will measure our outcome utilizing attendance data.

In our 9th grade cohort, we will provide support and interventions to decrease chronic (10%+) truancy from 32% of the cohort to 29% of the cohort.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus quarterly with our Attendance Team (Administrator, Social Worker, Behavior Specialist, Counselor). PBIS will also support with positive intervention strategies to celebrate student successes. Academic support, creating a sense of belonging, and reinforcing schoolwide expectations will contribute to students' investment in our school and likelihood that they will be committed to improving their attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

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.)

Research shows that when students are in a safe and supportive environment, achievement gaps decrease, proficiency increases, and overall, social and emotional well being is improved. Focusing on our school culture will foster an environment for positive learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The goal of academic advising, creating a sense of belonging, and teaching and reinforcing schoolwide expectations is to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes at our school. Furthermore, building students' academic investment in school will improve their attendance.

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.

Academic Advising - ensuring that all students are scheduled in the courses that they need for graduation (Including credit recovery), counselors meet with students fall and spring to review academic history and status and develop or revise the four year plan in place for the student.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing - each semester based on individual student credit data

Creating a Sense of Belonging: When students are involved and have a sense of belonging, they are more successful:

- Panther Force - Freshmen learn more about life as a Panther. They will have the opportunity to meet the faculty and staff and interact with other 9th grade Panthers. (July 28th)
- Club Rush - Clubs, sports, and activities have booths and students/staff representatives are available at lunch to recruit new members.
- Athletic Director Betty Rodriguez will identify at risk students and assist them with finding a place to "belong" outside of the classroom.

Person Responsible: Adam Kurtz (adamjk@leeschools.et)

By When: Panther Force will be held July 28th before school starts. Club Rush occurs in September. Our Athletic Director will identify students in an ongoing manner and provide guidance.

Teaching and Reinforcing Schoolwide Expectations:

- Teach schoolwide PRIDE Expectations
- Pride expectations posted in every classroom and common area
- Students earn Panther Pride tickets for displaying PRIDE expectations
- Monthly reinforcers for students with Panther Pride tickets
- Intervention and Behavior Specialist create PBIPs for students who are struggling to meet PRIDE expectations or impacting learning
- Class meetings to discuss upcoming events, review academic history and graduation requirements
- Meetings with parents and students to discuss deadlines, review academic histories and identify paths for success.

Person Responsible: Liam Farrell (liamcf@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing-each quarter we will celebrate/reflect on students' academic, behavioral, and/or attendance successes and areas for growth.

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

To support our 9th grade cohort and their progress toward graduation, we are going to focus on increasing our 9th graders on track for graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In SY 22-23, 34% of our freshman class earned at least one grade of F for at least one semester of school, meaning that they are now credit deficient and not on track to graduate without remediation. Our goal is to reduce the percentage of freshmen earning at least one failing semester grade from 34% to 30% in SY 23-24.

Monitoring:

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

We will provide weekly monitoring of students' grades, attendance, credits, and, therefore, their progress toward graduation. Student success will be evident as we measure the number of students in the 9th grade cohort who are on track for graduation as compared to the cohort in SY 22-23.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

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.)

Research has demonstrated that early intervention for high school freshmen is key to their success and engagement in high school and beyond (Flannery et al., 2020).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our focus on early intervention for freshmen is driven by our desire to engage students and parents in the academic process earlier in students' high school careers. With this approach, we will be able to identify students needing additional support and provide them interventions beginning in their 9th grade year.

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.

The systems we have in place will allow support for our 9th grade cohort. We will measure this success by including a 9th grade class in-school onboarding day during the first week of school. This on-boarding will review the academic and behavioral expectations for students at our school (academic histories, GPA, academic requirements for graduation). A team of staff members and administration will develop a plan during pre-school. Guidance from administration will ensure interpretation of the outcome is clearly monitored.

Person Responsible: Adam Kurtz (adamjk@leeschools.et)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

The systems we have in place will allow support for our 9th grade cohort. Pre-school onboarding for incoming freshmen called Panther Force. This is an introduction of expectations and an initiation into our school's culture. The 9th grade sponsor and 11th and 12th grade students will organize the event following the expectations set forth by administration. Administration will ensure the agenda is organized, presentations are reviewed and interpretation of expectations are clear.

Person Responsible: Adam Kurtz (adamjk@leeschools.et)

By When: This onboarding event will be held July 28th. All 9th graders are invited to attend.

The systems we have in place will allow support for our 9th grade cohort. We will provide a parent onboarding night which will include information regarding academic histories, GPA, and academic requirements for graduation. The College and Career Specialist, Guidance team, and administration will plan and organize the onboarding night.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

The systems we have in place will allow support for our 9th grade cohort. Administration, teachers, and other staff will pull weekly lists of 9th graders with 1 or more Fs and provide parent communication and student-specific interventions.

- Parent meetings with a counselor and teacher for students who have 1 F in a course.
- Two or more Fs meet with an administrator or Intervention Specialist; the student will be scheduled into an E2020 course to retrieve credit.

Administration will guide this process to ensure that all parties involved are clear and understand expectations.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

The systems we have in place will allow support for our 9th grade cohort. Weekly School Messengers will be sent to families to ensure that parents understand how to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

From the SY 21-22 to the SY 22-23 data, there was a decline in our school's graduation rate. Our goal is to prepare students for a college and/or career path; graduation rate is a key indicator of our success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our graduation rate from 88% in SY 22-23 to 90% in SY 23-24.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor this goal daily by using our district's Grad Tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

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.)

Our Evidence-Based Intervention is to provide student-tailored interventions to seniors needing testing and GPA requirements for graduation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the past, one of our barriers surrounding graduation rate was that we did eliminate students in the ESE and ELL programs who qualified for waivers early in their high school career. With the options for ELL alternate scores and ESE waivers, we should be able to narrow our focus to the students who need more opportunities for interventions. Furthermore, some of our students in SY22-23 required end-of-year interventions to catch them up from low first semester performance. We will intervene earlier in SY 23-24.

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.

The desired result is to ensure our students are meeting the graduation requirements. Our Reading Coach, Math Coach, and Testing Coordinator will track seniors' completion of testing requirements for graduation, ensuring that they are scheduled for upcoming assessments including SAT and ACT. The graduation tracker will assist us in monitoring the data and will ensure the process interpretation is clear.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year in order to meet or exceed our goal.

The desired result is to ensure our students are meeting the graduation requirements. Our counselors, College and Career Specialist, Intervention Specialist, and Behavior Specialist will meet with seniors to review their progress toward graduation. Academic histories, the graduation tracker, and the current grades/schedule will be monitored to ensure interpretation of the is clear.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year in order to meet or exceed our goal.

The desired result is to ensure our students are meeting the graduation requirements. The testing coordinator and the administrator overseeing testing, will work to communicate the testing needs for each student and reach out to families to communicate testing needs. Academic histories, the graduation tracker, testing platforms will be used to ensure that the information communicated is accurate.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year in order to meet or exceed our goal.

The desired result is to ensure our students are meeting the graduation requirements. Our Literacy Coach will begin testing after the first week of school and then will offer testing opportunities on a regular basis for our ESOL students. This will be monitored and discussed with the Literacy Coach bi-weekly to ensure that the interpretation and expectations are clear.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year in order to meet or exceed our goal.

The desired result is to ensure our students are meeting the graduation requirements. Students are scheduled into Reading classes based on the most recent assessments. ESE Waivers will be completed as students become eligible. The waiver Google tracking form and the graduation tracker will be used to monitor waiver completion.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year in order to meet or exceed our goal.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

From the SY 21-22 to the SY 22-23 data, there was a 4% increase in our school's 10th grade ELA proficiency. Our goal is to continue to increase proficiency with our 10th grade ELA students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our 10th grade ELA proficiency from 51% in SY 22-23 55% in SY 23-24.

Monitoring:

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

The administrator and Reading Coach will attend PLCs. During PLCs, the team will monitor exemplars, Reading Inventory, End of Workshop assessments, StudySync quizzes, StudySync Assessments, data analysis and student data chat notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

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.)

Cypress Lake High School will continue to utilize PLCs to review data and focus on areas of need for our students. Additionally, we will incorporate strategies and tools from PLC discussions, while incorporating the Key 43 (Model of Instruction) within the classroom. This will assist with the overall goal of student proficiency growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELA Proficient - Proficiency is the minimum requirement necessary to meet the state requirement for graduation. As a school it is a priority to increase the amount of students at or above the proficiency level in order to meet the state graduation requirement.

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.

The systems we have in place will allow ELA proficiency to continue to increase. We will measure this success by analyzing the data collected during PLC (exemplars, Reading Inventory, End of Workshop assessments, StudySync Assessments, and the data analysis from student led chats). PLCs will be guided by our Reading Coach to ensure that the interpretations and expectations are clear and concise. Administrative involvement in PLCs and walkthroughs will also support the interpretations of the goals.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

The system we have in place will allow ELA proficiency to continue to increase. Instructional pacing guides will be monitored through administrator walkthroughs, PLC discussions, and formative assessments data analysis.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

The Reading Coach will meet regularly with 10th grade ELA and Reading teachers. The Reading Coach will push-in as needed to model lessons and support the teacher/classroom needs. Administrative walkthroughs and PLC discussions will monitor pacing and the use of instructional guides.

Person Responsible: Candyce Bond (candycejb@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the plan throughout the school year.

#5. 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 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.

When examining Math achievement data, our ESE subgroup is lower than all others. This is an area of opportunity for our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to move our Math achievement data for our ESE students from 8% to 10% proficient in SY 23-24.

Monitoring:

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

The Math PLC, in particular the Algebra 1/Geometry team, is tracking each student on a weekly basis, and our Math coach is assisting teachers in developing and maintaining their student data tracking systems and procedures. In addition to tracking student data with teacher-developed assessments, the Math PLC is utilizing STAR and BEST Algebra 1/Geometry data after each assessment window to track student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

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.)

PLC work with Math achievement as a focus is the main strategy for tracking and implementing instructional supports for this goal. As PLCs meet, they will plan specific interventions for all students needing additional Math help, which will include Students with Disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLC work is supported through research by Marzano and DuFour. The faculty is familiar with the PLC process and implementation.

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.

The Math PLC, with Algebra 1/Geometry breakout, will meet weekly during common planning to discuss progress, identify students at increased risk (with a particular focus on Students with Disabilities), and create action plans for the next cycle.

Person Responsible: Lauren Robinson (laurencro@leeschools.net)

By When: Administration will monitor this throughout the school year with data being released May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department.