Cypress Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cypress Elementary School

2251 LAKESIDE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

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

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.

Our Mission is to establish a community where all children feel loved, respected and encouraged to developed to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A school of excellence for all learners.

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
Raymond, Libby	Principal	I To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student's success, all teams and students will be positively impacted.
Faust, Megan	Assistant Principal	To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards students success. To facilitate and support the school's stocktake meetings to continually analyze our progress towards our SIP goals and action steps.
Bernardo, Tiffany	Math Coach	Will work with all staff to ensure a problem solving culture across content areas for all students. The coach will work with teachers through the coaching cycle based off the teachers growth needs. All instructional personnel will have a focus on meeting the needs of all students while reaching the depth of the standards and increasing student discourse.
Laguerre, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	Will work with all staff to ensure a literature rich culture across all content for all students. The coach will work with teachers through the coaching cycle based on the teachers professional growth needs. Coach will help lead teams to having a focus on meeting all needs of the students with high expectations and the depth of the standards
Waller, Marcia	Other	Mrs. Waller will work alongside teachers to help develop new strategies for studen'ts success.
Duran, Maritza	ELL Compliance Specialist	Mrs. Duran will work with students and teachers to utilize ELLevation and ELL strategies to meet the needs of our students and help with achieving learning goals.

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.

Leadership team members were invited to the development meetings for input. During the first preplanning day, the SIP was shared with teachers and staff and asked for specific input. During the first SAC meeting, parents are asked for input in the SIP plan. Input from the staff, parents, and community members was collected from the meetings and used to revise the plan to ensure that everyone is involved in the process.

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))

Monthly stock take meetings will be planned for monitoring the implementation of the SIP plan and revising will happen during regular leadership meetings weekly. The SIP plan will also be reviewed at monthly SAC meetings to elicit feedback from parents, staff, and other members of the community.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
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	68	90	86	86	76	79	0	0	0	485
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	23	18	18	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	19	7	9	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	24	33	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	32	24	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	24	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	90
	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	3	1	0	33	31	35	0	0	0	103

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	27	34	24	17	18	18	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	5	1	3	1	8	4	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	7	3	7	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	6	5	4	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	25	24	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	28	27	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	25	27	0	0	0	53

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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	27	34	24	17	18	18	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	5	1	3	1	8	4	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	7	3	7	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	6	5	4	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	25	24	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	28	27	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	25	27	0	0	0	53

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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	15
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*	31	44	53	38	48	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				50			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			57		
Math Achievement*	39	46	59	40	44	50	34		
Math Learning Gains				59			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			40		
Science Achievement*	34	43	54	36	46	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	47			43		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	16	Yes	2	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			

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%
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	1	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	43			

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	31			39			34					53
SWD	12			12			8				5	31
ELL	26			29			22				5	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			44							2	
HSP	29			36			28				5	50
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	42			58							2	
FRL	30			37			29				5	54

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	38	50	43	40	59	64	36					47
SWD	6	37	43	20	54	58	6					29
ELL	30	46	46	34	57	55	23					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			44								
HSP	33	48	41	35	55	62	28					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58	58		68	75							
FRL	33	48	44	34	57	58	29					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	37	43	57	34	36	40	29					43
SWD	13	26	36	28	46	36	17					37
ELL	27	46	38	29	35	23	33					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			45								
HSP	35	44	55	31	37	38	31					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			56								
FRL	28	35	56	29	33	28	18					45

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	28%	44%	-16%	54%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	49%	-20%	58%	-29%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	59%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	48%	-11%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	41%	1%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	40%	-10%	51%	-21%

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.

When considering our data, our science and ELA scores showed the lowest performance. Our science showed 30% of our students as proficient and 34% proficient in ELA. Our science scores were low due to the academic vocabulary and reading required to be successful in science, and our ELA scores have been on a downward trend post COVID.

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

When considering the areas of greatest decline, they are in ELA and science. Our science saw a 6% decline, and our ELA saw a 4% decline. Students are struggling as readers which is contributing to the decline in their ability to be proficient in ELA and 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.

When considering our data in relationship to the state, our ELA data is substantially below the state average. The factors contributing to this gap and trends is in our planning, standards-based instruction, and our Tier 1 ELA block. The state adopted new standards, and our teachers need further support in standards-based instruction. As we move into this new school year, we will place a heavy focus of Tier 1 instruction in ELA to include intensive coaching support.

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

Our math data continuously is improving. We are gaining proficiency points each year, and we are showing large amounts of students hitting their growth marks. Our school has placed a heavy focus on math intervention and before school math incentives for math fluency. These actions have shown to improve our school's math scores.

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

When reflecting on our EWS data, our 5th grade is an area of concern. Their number of level 1s is the highest in math and ELA, and they also have the largest number of students who have two or more indicators. About half of the students (35) have two or more indicators, which is definitely concerning.

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

Our highest priority for school improvement is standards-based instruction through a strong focus on our Tier 1 instruction. We will use common planning and coaching cycles to help grow our teachers within Tier 1. We know that we can not intervene our way out of a Tier 1 concern, so we will have strong system and structures to increase Tier 1 instruction.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Based on our ELA data from the 2022-2023 school year, 31% of students performed at a level 3 or higher based on the PM 3 FAST assessment, and 12% of our students who are ESE performed at a level 3 or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, at least 50% of students will perform at a level of 3 or higher based on the PM 3 FAST assessment, and 41% of our students are ESE will perform at a level 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Our ELA will be monitored through PM1 and PM2 assessments, classroom walkthrough tool, formative assessments, and common planning notes.
Classroom walkthroughs will occur weekly by coach and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Laguerre (elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.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.)

The evidence-based intervention will be explicit instruction aligned to the standards and intended learning. Tiered interventions will be provided to target specific instructional needs of students using Corrective Reading and Lexia Core 5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When considering our data, there needs to be explicit instruction aligned to the standards and intended learning for students to be proficient as deemed through their assessments. Based on Dr. Hattie's research, direct instruction has a .60 effect size. With a strong focus on direct, explicit instruction on the standards and the intended learning for students will increase students' level of proficiency.

Tiered interventions provide opportunities for students to close the achievement gap based on their individual needs. When considering the data, Corrective Reading is a strong resource for Tier 3 students in closing the achievement gap: Corrective Reading (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong). Lexia Core 5 is a strong resource for all tiers: Lexia Core 5 (ESSA Rating: Promising).

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.

Each grade level will be provided a planning day each quarter to work with leadership team and support on standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Laguerre (elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net)

By When: July 2023

Weekly common planning sessions with coaches to look at upcoming instruction and expected outcomes and misconceptions of students.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Laguerre (elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

Tier instructional support needed. Leadership team will be walk all classrooms to build support plans for all teachers based on their specific needs. A Microsoft Form will be used to track.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Laguerre (elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

VPK PLT - create a team to work on VPK instructional practice, standards, support, and parental involvement. Meet as a team monthly.

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Leadership will share plan for instructional support for ELA including common planning, coaching support, and student instructional support through Falcon University.

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Meeting will happen to analyze formative classroom data, STAR data, and PM1 data with a deep dive into ELA with coaching logs.

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Meeting will happen to analyze formative classroom data, STAR data, and PM2 data with a deep dive into ELA with coaching logs.

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January 2023

Meeting will happen to analyze formative classroom data and STAR data with a deep dive into ELA with coaching logs.

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math
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.
Based on the 2022-2023 PM3 FAST Assessment in math, our students scored 42% proficient, and 14% of our students who are ESE scored proficient.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
By the end of the 2023-2024 year, 50% of our students will score as proficient on the PM 3 FAST Assessment, and 41% of our ESE students will be proficient on the PM3 FAST Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
PM1, PM2, and classroom walkthroughs will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.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.)
Direct, explicit standards-based instruction with teacher clarity will be our evidenced based strategy. Students need direct, explicit instruction aligned to the standards, and the teachers need to have clarity and to be clear with the students on the learning and expectations. Dreambox learning will be used as a resource to increase instructional support for students and decrease the achievement gap.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Based on Dr. Hattie's research, direct instruction has a .60 effect size and teacher clarity has an effect size of .75. With a strong focus on direct, explicit instruction on the standards and teacher clarity and the intended learning for students will increase students' level of proficiency. To further consider the research of evidenced based intervention, Dreambox Learning is rated as "Strong" for the ESSA Evidence Based Rating.
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.
Each grade level will be provided a planning day each quarter to work with leadership team and support on standards-based instruction.
Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: July 2023

Weekly common planning sessions with the coach to look at upcoming instruction and expected outcomes and misconceptions of students.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

Tier instructional support needed. Leadership team will be walk all classrooms to build support plans for all teachers based on their specific needs. A Microsoft Form will be used to track.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Small group instruction - direct instruction based on the standards will be provided within the small group and scaffolded to provide support for all students to be successful.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

#3. 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.

Based on our Insight Survey data of teachers in 2019 60% of teachers felt like they received support after feedback to help improve their instruction. In 2022, only 46% of teachers felt like they received instructional support after feedback.

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

By May 2023, 60% of teachers will feel as though they receive support after feedback to improve instructional practice.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through feedback provided, coaching logs, and periodic staff surveys to monitor their feelings about feedback that will be shared through weekly newsletters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.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.)

Instructional coaches will be used to help improve instruction. They will be working with teachers on common planning of instruction, walkthroughs, and providing coaching based off of feedback and teacher specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on Hattie's research, instructional coaching has an effect size of .51 on student achievement. This shows that it positively impacts student learning and instruction.

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.

Weekly common planning with teachers on their upcoming instruction in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Laguerre (elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By September 1st

Tiering of instructional need and support for teachers

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 10

Coaching plans and logs to document teacher support

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September

Leadership meetings to discuss student data related to instructional coaching support of teachers

Person Responsible: Megan Faust (megan.faust@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment, our 5th grade students scored 30% proficient.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 year, 50% of our students will score as proficient on the 5th grade Statewide Science Assessment. 41% of our ESE students will be proficient on the 5th grade Statewide Science Assessment.

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

NWEA progress monitoring assessments, classroom assessments, and classroom walkthroughs will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.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.)

Direct, explicit standards-based instruction with teacher clarity will be our evidenced based strategy. Students need direct, explicit instruction aligned to the standards, and the teachers need to have clarity and to be clear with the students on the learning and expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on Dr. Hattie's research, direct instruction has a .60 effect size and teacher clarity has an effect size of .75. With a strong focus on direct, explicit instruction on the standards and teacher clarity and the intended learning for students will increase students' level of proficiency.

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.

Each grade level will be provided a planning day each quarter to work with leadership team and support on standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

Weekly common planning sessions with the coach to look at upcoming instruction and expected outcomes and misconceptions of students.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

Tier instructional support needed. Leadership team will be walk all classrooms to build support plans for all teachers based on their specific needs. A Microsoft Form will be used to track.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By August 2023

A science lab will be utilized for hands-on experiences related to the current content being taught.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By September 2023

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).

Our Reading Coach, Math Coach, and Interventionist supports our SWDs through analyzing data, planning for interventions, providing interventions to support SWDs learning, and supporting instruction in the classroom to ensure that students are receiving high quality instruction.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

When considering the data for Kindergarten through 2nd grade, all of our grade levels showed more than 50% of our students below level 3 on the statewide assessments.

Kindergarten - 53.2%
1st Grade - 51.8%
2nd Grade - 60.5%

Teachers will use Open Court to continue to consistently address the foundational skills of reading, along with Benchmark the district adopted reading curriculum.

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

When considering the data for 3rd-5th grade, all of our grade levels showed more than 50% of our students below level 3 on the 2023 statewide assessment:

3rd grade - 66%
4th grade - 71%
5th grade - 72%

Direct, explicit instruction on the standards will be provided in grades 3-5, and tiered support for students to close the achievement gap.

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 51% or more of our K-2 students will score proficient based on the STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 51% or more of our 3rd-5th graders will score proficient based on the ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The area of focus will be monitored through consistent weekly walkthrough by leadership team members, classroom formative assessments, and progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Faust, Megan, megan.faust@osceolaschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based intervention will be explicit instruction aligned to the standards and intended learning, including an intentional look at how we are teaching foundational skills in VPK-2. For tier 1 instruction, Open Court and Benchmark Advance will be used in K-5 for the 90 minute reading block. For tier 2 and tier 3 instruction, Magnetic Reading, Lexia Core5, and Corrective Reading will be used depending on the students specific needs to close the achievement gap.

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

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

When considering our data, there needs to be explicit instruction aligned to the standards and intended learning for students to be proficient as deemed through their assessments. Based on Dr. Hattie's research, direct instruction has a .60 effect size. With a strong focus on direct, explicit instruction on the standards and the intended learning for students will increase students' level of proficiency.

Corrective Reading (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong)
Open Court Foundational Skills (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: Strong)
Lexia Core 5 (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong
Florida Benchmark Advance 2022, Florida Edition (FLDOE Review of Instructional Materials Percent of Alignment- K-96.78%, 1st- 100%, 2nd-85.94%, 3rd-81.25%, 4th-79.68%, 5th- 95.31%)

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team will be created and meet to work to move the initiative of literacy throughout the school year.	Laguerre, Elizabeth, elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Coaching - weekly common planning sessions with K-5 (and monthly for VPK) to plan out standards aligned lessons with coach support. Literacy coach will facilitate the planning and grow team leads who then will be able to lead the planning. Tiered coaching support will be provided based off of the different teachers' needs. The leadership team will develop a plan to scaffold coaching and support in ELA to increase student achievement.	Faust, Megan, megan.faust@osceolaschools.net
Assessment - Checkpoints or formative assessments will be used to determine students' understanding of the standard taught that week. Students will be remediated based off of their performance on the assessment and rechecked.	Laguerre, Elizabeth, elizabeth.laguerre@osceolaschools.net
Professional Learning - District led ELA PD will be provided on our Professional Learning Day - Job embedded PD will be provided during weekly common planning sessions with teachers and their teams. Kagan training was provided over the summer and will be provided again during the school year.	Faust, Megan, megan.faust@osceolaschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Disseminating information of our School Improvement Plan to our stakeholders is crucial in creating a culture of growth for our school. When considering how to share this information, we think about the best ways to engage in conversations with our community and families. We have started a Coffee and Conversations with the Principal before schools the last Tuesday of the month where we shared our School Improvement Plan and provided families the opportunity to provide feedback on our School Improvement Plan as we were working on it. Each month, we share pictures and updates of the work we are doing that is aligned to our SIP at these meetings and answer any questions needed. There is always translation provided through our PowerPoint presentation and through a translator.

https://www.osceolaschools.net/cyes

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community members through our Coffee and Conversations with the Principals monthly, Academic Night (October 2023), Multicultural Night (February 2024), and Fine Arts Night (May 2024). We will also be holding a report card night to provide parents the opportunity to meet to discuss their child's progress with their teacher.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Cypress Elementary School is on it's way to becoming a Fine Arts Magnet to be a feeder school for the Osceola School of the Arts. We were recently allocated a teacher for Theater to provide an additional enrichment to our curriculum for students that will provide engagement in reading and speaking. In addition to this, we have several teachers who are being trained to work with students on acceleration and gifted, one who is working on their Master's Degree in Gifted Education through the GLIMPSE program. Through these opportunities and programs, we are hoping to encourage and build a culture of enrichment for learning and arts for our students that will lead to an increase in academic success.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Cypress Elementary School is fortunate to have a very active school social worker and school counselor that work closely with the FIT program. Through the FIT program, we are able to provide additional resources for students who have additional needs and their families. Our SRO also provides Shop with a Cop to several of our students each year around the holidays.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Title I money is not used to provide mental health services at Cypress Elementary School.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Cypress Elementary School has a strong focus on AVID and Kagan. We are working with our students to develop skills that will help lead them to being college and career ready. Several of our teachers are trained each year in AVID.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Using Title I funding, Cypress Elementary School has a part time interventionist that helps to address the needs of students in addition to already provided school personnel. Through these efforts, we are able to target specific learning and behavior needs of our students.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

In an effort to increase engagement in learning, our teachers have been trained in KAGAN, and they have provided training to other staff here on campus. In addition to this, they have been provided additional time to analyze data from assessments to plan for upcoming instruction and plan for the resources listed for interventions in ELA, math, and science.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Cypress Elementary School is participating in the PRAISE program with FAU, where we are working with our literacy coach, administrative team, EES, and our VPK paraprofessionals on our VPK program to help prepare our students for kindergarten. It is a PLT that we work in monthly to look at our current data in VPK, instructional practice, and how we can support our teachers and the students' learning.