

Pasco County Schools

Cypress Creek High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cypress Creek High School

8701 OLD PASCO RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33544

<https://cchs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

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.

H-Have a growth mindset

O-Own your education

W-Work as a community

L-Lead responsibly

Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students wil achieve success in college, career, and life.

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
Hetzler-Nettles, Carin	Principal	Responsible for ensuring a quality education for every student by coaching school leadership teams. This includes developing the knowledge, skills, and abilities in these teams throughout the district to effectively implement district priorities; providing differentiated support to specific school leaders; and monitoring efforts to ensure implementation that will lead to student success. Also responsible for working closely with the Assistant Superintendent for Student Achievement and Learning Community Executive Directors to facilitate support between the central offices and schools focused on academic achievement and equitable practices for all.
Ferry, jena	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
fewox, Sonja	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Garrett, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Weaver, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies PLC Facilitator
Witman, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	English PLC Facilitator
Hamilton, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Math PLC Facilitator
Uchacz, Dan	Teacher, K-12	Science PLC Facilitator
Alfonso, Kandis	Teacher, K-12	World Language PLC Advisor
Jakich, Karen	Teacher, K-12	CTE PLC Advisor

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.

Prior to reviewing the comprehensive needs of the school, the team was consulted to develop the plan. Once the draft was completed, it was reviewed, adjustments were made, as needed, and the final plan was developed.

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))

We will review it periodically through the School Leadership Team, analyze data, and revise it as needed. Progress will be communicated with all stakeholders (SAC, staff members, etc.) and revised, 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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
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	

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*	53	49	50	57	51	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				53			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			42		
Math Achievement*	47	40	38	54	35	38	48		
Math Learning Gains				44			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28			24		
Science Achievement*	65	66	64	70	50	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	67	66	64	49	48	78		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	92	91	89	99	63	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	72	67	65	43	68	67	33		
ELP Progress	29	46	45	27			48		

** 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	92

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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	583
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	99

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	41			
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	54			
HSP	58			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	53			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	44			
HSP	48			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	48			

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	53			47			65	75		92	72	29
SWD	30			28			46	33		19	6	
ELL	15			23			34	48		65	7	29
AMI												
ASN	62			52			67	100		93	6	
BLK	38			30			47	57		58	6	
HSP	51			38			60	69		72	7	24
MUL	55			42			66	54			4	
PAC												
WHT	56			59			71	81		73	6	
FRL	38			34			52	68		60	7	31

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	57	53	44	54	44	28	70	64		99	43	27
SWD	29	37	33	21	34	39	24	26		100	7	
ELL	21	46	40	35	42	32	40	12		100	26	27
AMI												
ASN	61	39		71	64		67	93				
BLK	33	44	40	32	32	29	44	61		100	29	
HSP	54	50	35	51	44	24	67	50		100	38	19
MUL	39	35		50	55					100	25	
PAC												
WHT	63	57	52	59	44	33	77	71		99	48	
FRL	46	50	42	44	38	32	58	47		100	31	35

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	56	51	42	48	31	24	63	78		100	33	48
SWD	20	36	37	24	28	26	28	65		100	26	
ELL	16	37	42	25	26	15	30			100	6	48
AMI												
ASN	85	72		94	46		94					
BLK	44	40	30	24	27	21	48	80		100	18	
HSP	42	46	44	36	25	23	53	73		100	40	46
MUL	46	40		35	10		45					
PAC												
WHT	63	54	43	59	37	29	71	82		99	30	
FRL	42	41	31	40	29	25	54	67		100	22	48

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	58%	51%	7%	50%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	48%	0%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	48%	7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	63%	12%

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.

We will focus on math achievement. Though improvements were made, the levels are still struggling to increase in comparison to preCovid. Teacher turnover and teachers struggling with new course content contributed to low performance.

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

Social Studies shows the greatest decline from the prior year. Teacher turnover contributed to this decline.

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.

In comparison to the state data, Social Studies was at a 64. Teacher turnover contributed to the gaps along with the delivery of instruction.

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

Science showed the most improvement. The science PLC collaborated on a Biology EOC prep course that was offered to students daily after school.

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

N/A

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

Improve achievement levels, and learning gains in math, science achievement, and social studies achievement.

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.

Based on the Gallup survey and parent feedback, we will restructure the feedback loop with students, and the community to increase engagement in shared decision-making.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Gallup survey results will improve by 1%.

Monitoring:

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

- Incorporate QR code feedback surveys for community after each large event.
- Hallway "Captains" will be utilized to create a team to improve culture & community in each building.
- SGA den discussions will be held monthly with input from each class via school-wide inventory.
- SGA den discussions will focus on school-wide goals & improvement.
- SGA/PACK Leaders will be utilized to connect new students to CCHS to our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sonja fewox (sfewox@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- *Monitor and provide feedback to teachers and students through collaborative discussions
- *Promote school learning climate by supporting teachers' instructional time, and addressing concerns within PLC/SLT
- *Professional development, emphasizing data-driven decision-making and positively interacting with students and teachers
- *Review, collaborate and develop processes/procedures, and culture building based on surveys

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School climate and culture impact student achievement and teacher retainment.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 testing data, we will implement tiered supports for academics and behavior for underperforming and/or underrepresented subgroups within all core academic classrooms.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Targeted instructional focus in all core academic areas on underperforming subgroup achievement (ESE, ELL) and lowest 35% in all categories will decrease by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

- Expand use of Academic Lunch to increase work completion of students.
- Utilize extended academic periods to implement strategic tier 2 differentiated supports to students based upon testing data and/or quarterly check data.
- PLC leads will be trained in data collection prior to end of 22-23 SY.
- Core academic PLC leads will lead planning week sessions with departments on use of data to drive instruction.
- Targeted instructional focus in all core academic areas on underperforming subgroup achievement (ESE, ELL) and lowest 35% in all categories.
- Administration will continue weekly Notice/Wonder walkthroughs, and will provide staff with feedback and deliberate, personalized strategies to improve their practice.
- Administration will create and utilize a digital walkthrough data gathering tool to inform professional development, best practices, and personalized feedback to staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sonja fewox (sfewox@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will analyze a range of data from the prior year at the school level to focus on areas that need improvement schoolwide, at the classroom level to focus on the teacher's instructional strengths and weaknesses, and at the student level to focus on the instructional needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data should be analyzed at the school, classroom, and student level in order to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and to determine how best to improve the quality of instruction. This data should not be limited to student achievement data, but could also include data reflecting the school's climate, community, implementation of curriculum, and quality of instruction. Data should be widely distributed and teachers and administrators should be taught how to correctly interpret and use data so as to develop expertise in the use of data.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools

analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.