

Polk County Public Schools

# Cypress Junction Montessori School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>21</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>23</b> |

# Cypress Junction Montessori

220 5TH ST SW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

[www.cypressjunction.org](http://www.cypressjunction.org)

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

Cypress Junction Montessori encourages the development of the whole child by providing a comprehensive Montessori education.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

We do this through:

- Cultivating independent thought, foundational skills, awareness of their environment, empathy for others, social ease, and high self-esteem in every student.
- Establishing within each child the intellectual, emotional, and physical rigor needed to become a self directed learner, flexible thinker, and creative problem solver.
- Supporting each student's ever-increasing curiosity about the world in which they live.
- Instilling the values and skills necessary to help our students to grow up to be successful global citizens.
- Bringing academic standards and student passions together to fuel a desire to learn.
- Cypress Junction Montessori sets children on a path that embraces creativity, builds self awareness and helps them develop the academic skills, physical tools and personal confidence necessary for lifelong success.

### 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   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Newman-Lake, Kris   | Principal           | Principal / Head of School responsible for carrying out the mission and vision of the school, strategic planning and partnerships, while overseeing all school operations and management; CEO of CJM, Inc. and reports directly to the CJM Board of Directors.  |
| hilliard, teresa    | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal / Assistant Head of School supports the Principal / Head of School in carrying out the mission and vision of the school, supporting strategic planning and partnerships and overseeing all school operations and management and is currently the appointed CFO for CJM, Inc. as directed by the Head of School. |
| foster, kimberly-jo | Dean                | Dean of Academic Affairs -  |
| clark, jill         | Instructional Coach | school-based academic instructional Montessori coach  |
| reyes, tatiana      | Teacher, ESE        | ESE coordinator and ESE teacher   |
| helms, natalie      | Teacher, K-12       | Lead Teacher for grades 1, 2, and 3   |
| benjamin, sue       | Teacher, PreK       | Lead Teacher for PREK 3, VPK 4, and Kindergarten  |
| martin, kristin     | Teacher, K-12       | Lead Teacher for grades 4, 5, and 6   |
| brower, scottee     | Teacher, K-12       | Lead Teacher for grades 7 and 8   |

**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.

In the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process, we engage various stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, students, and board members. This inclusive approach encompasses meetings, surveys, and questionnaires to gather input comprehensively. We analyze this feedback rigorously, leading to a draft SIP that reflects a balance of stakeholder perspectives. After iterative feedback and revisions, we finalize the SIP, which guides improvement efforts. Stakeholder involvement continues during implementation and evaluation, fostering ongoing engagement and accountability, ultimately ensuring the SIP aligns with the collective vision of the educational community.

**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))

Our SIP is subject to ongoing scrutiny through regular data analysis, with a keen focus on narrowing achievement gaps. This process ensures that we remain agile in our efforts, responding to emerging needs and continually fine-tuning our strategies for improving student achievement, in alignment with State standards. When necessary, our SIP undergoes a structured revision process. This begins with thorough data analysis, followed by soliciting valuable input from stakeholders. We then adjust our goals and strategies based on this feedback, documenting all changes meticulously. The revised SIP is subsequently put into action, and we continue to monitor its impact to ensure that our educational objectives are met effectively.

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 33%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 0%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | N/A  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>White Students (WHT) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: C<br>2018-19: C<br>2017-18: C   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

**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   | 9           | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 32    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8     |
| Course failure in Math  | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 15    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1           | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17    |

**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           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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   | 9           | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 32    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8     |
| Course failure in Math  | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 15    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1           | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17    |

**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           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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*                | 62     | 48       | 53    | 73     | 51       | 55    | 63     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 58     |          |       | 61     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 39     |          |       | 67     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 56     | 49       | 55    | 65     | 37       | 42    | 58     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 65     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 57     |          |       | 56     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 59     | 47       | 52    | 35     | 48       | 54    | 50     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 82     | 68       | 68    | 88     | 53       | 59    | 67     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 38     | 61       | 70    | 45     | 43       | 51    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 54       | 74    |        | 46       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 39       | 53    |        | 71       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 50       | 55    |        | 55       | 70    |        |          |       |

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 60  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 362 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 6   |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| Percent Tested             | 99 |
| Graduation Rate            |    |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 58  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 522 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 9   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 36                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 23                              | Yes                | 1   | 1   |
| HSP                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 72                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 59                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 41                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 51                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 67                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 62       |        |             | 56        |         |              | 59       | 82      | 38        |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 44       |        |             | 28        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 36       |        |             | 9         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 56       |        |             | 44        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 69       |        |             | 66        |         |              | 67       | 88      |           |                   | 5                   |              |
| FRL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 73       | 58     | 39          | 65        | 62      | 57           | 35       | 88      | 45        |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 69       | 60     |             | 38        | 70      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 36       |        |             | 45        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 68       | 47     |             | 53        | 35      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 79       | 68     | 62          | 72        | 71      | 67           | 35       | 82      |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 63       | 61     | 67          | 58        | 65      | 56           | 50       | 67      |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 43       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 50       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 55       | 80     |             | 36        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 69       | 60     |             | 65        | 69      |              | 67       | 73      |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

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

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

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

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 71%    | 43%      | 28%                        | 54%   | 17%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 36%      | 19%                        | 47%   | 8%                      |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 39%      | 20%                        | 47%   | 12%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 53%      | 5%                         | 58%   | 0%                      |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 60%    | 35%      | 25%                        | 47%   | 13%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 42%      | 13%                        | 50%   | 5%                      |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 65%    | 38%      | 27%                        | 54%   | 11%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 82%    | 35%      | 47%                        | 48%   | 34%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 51%      | 4%                         | 59%   | -4%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 48%    | 56%      | -8%                        | 61%   | -13%                    |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 42%      | *                          | 55%   | *                       |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 44%      | 10%                        | 55%   | -1%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 44%    | 33%      | 11%                        | 44%   | 0%                      |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 67%    | 39%      | 28%                        | 51%   | 16%                     |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 37%      | 18%                        | 50%   | 5%                      |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 82%    | 65%      | 17%                        | 66%   | 16%                     |

### 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.**

For our science performance, we observed a notable decline in 2022, with only 35% of students achieving at or above grade level, compared to 50% in the previous year, 2021. Several factors may have contributed to this decline such as teacher transition, inexperienced educator, and student engagement. A key factor is the change in our teaching staff, particularly the hiring of a first-year teacher as a replacement for the previous instructor. Teacher transitions can impact instructional continuity and classroom dynamics, potentially affecting student outcomes. The appointment of a first-year teacher introduces an element of inexperience into the equation. New educators often require time to adapt to the school environment, develop effective teaching methods, and build their classroom management skills. An additional aspect to consider is student engagement. Were there changes in student motivation and participation levels? These factors can play a pivotal role in academic achievement.

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

Our science performance showed the greatest decline. We observed a notable decline in 2022, with only 35% of students achieving at or above grade level, compared to 50% in the previous year, 2021. Several factors may have contributed to this decline such as teacher transition, inexperienced educator, and student engagement. A key factor is the change in our teaching staff, particularly the hiring of a first-year teacher as a replacement for the previous instructor. Teacher transitions can impact instructional continuity and classroom dynamics, potentially affecting student outcomes. The appointment of a first-year teacher introduces an element of inexperience into the equation. New educators often require time to adapt to the school environment, develop effective teaching methods, and build their classroom management skills. An additional aspect to consider is student engagement. Were there changes in student motivation and participation levels? These factors can play a pivotal role in academic achievement.

**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 the 2021-22 school year, the science data revealed the most substantial disparity in performance, with CJM achieving 35% proficiency at or above the grade level standard, while the state achieved 53% proficiency at the same level. The contributing factors to this performance gap have been elaborated upon in previous responses. It is noteworthy that, despite the significant discrepancy in science achievement, CJM consistently outperformed the state and district in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Social Studies achievement.

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

The data component that exhibited the most substantial improvement was the performance on the Civics End of Course Assessment. In 2021, 67% of students were at or above grade level, while in 2022, this figure surged to an impressive 88%. This represents a notable improvement of 21 percentage points. To achieve this remarkable progress, our school implemented several key actions in the area of civics education such as Enhanced Curriculum, Assessment and Feedback, and Student Support. We revised and enhanced the civics curriculum to align it more closely with state standards and best practices in civics education. This ensured that students were well-prepared for the Civics End of Course Assessment. We implemented a system of regular formative assessments and provided timely feedback to both students and teachers. This allowed for ongoing monitoring of student progress and the



adjustment of instruction as needed. Recognizing that some students might require additional support, we established academic support programs and tutoring sessions to address individual learning needs.

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

Our primary area of focus and concern pertains to student absences. For the upcoming 2023-2024 school year, CJM has entered into a contract with a dedicated social worker to provide assistance to families experiencing excessive absenteeism. Additionally, we have taken proactive steps to ensure that our parents and guardians are well-informed about our expectations and the policies regarding absences established by PCPS.

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

Support for New Educators: Provide targeted support and mentorship programs for first-year teachers to accelerate their professional growth and classroom effectiveness. Montessori Alignment: Conduct a thorough review of the Montessori lessons to identify areas for improvement and alignment with grade-level state standards. Student Engagement Initiatives: Implement strategies to enhance student engagement, such as collaborative strategies. Ongoing Data Monitoring: Continuously monitor academic performance data to identify trends and adjust strategies accordingly.

**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 Early Warning System

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We are going to focus on positive culture and environment specifically relating to absences. We had 32 students miss 10% or more school days. Excessive absences from school can have a significant and detrimental impact on a student's performance.

### 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 school year, CJM aims to reduce the number of students missing 10% or more of school days to a maximum of 15 students. This represents a targeted reduction from the baseline data of 32 students who exceeded the 10% absenteeism threshold during the previous school year.

### Monitoring:

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

The first step in monitoring this outcome is to collect baseline data. At the beginning of the 2023-2024 school year, the school will identify and document the number of students who currently fall into the category of missing 10% or more of school days. This data will serve as the starting point for the monitoring process. Throughout the school year, attendance data will be continuously updated and maintained. This includes tracking the attendance of each student and calculating the percentage of days missed for all students. As part of the monitoring process, the school will engage with parents and guardians of students with chronic absenteeism. Communication will be maintained to ensure they are aware of their child's attendance status and any interventions in place.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kris Newman-Lake (knewmanlake@cypressjunction.org)

### 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.)

In the effort to mitigate absenteeism, a personalized attendance improvement plan could be devised for each student exhibiting chronic absences. It is worth noting that Montessori education places a significant emphasis on parental involvement. As part of our commitment to enhancing attendance, CJM will offer informative parent education sessions, emphasizing the significance of consistent attendance and equipping parents with strategies to facilitate regular attendance within the home environment. Furthermore, to address the issue of absenteeism effectively, the implementation of routine check-in sessions with students experiencing chronic absenteeism is envisioned. These check-ins will serve as a means to gain deeper insights into the specific challenges and needs of these students.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Personalized plans are chosen because they align with the Montessori philosophy of individualized learning. Montessori places a strong emphasis on the partnership between parents and educators. By offering parent education sessions on attendance, we aim to involve parents in the process and equip them with the knowledge and tools to support their child's regular attendance. Consistent check-ins with students who struggle with attendance align with Montessori's emphasis on observing and understanding each child's unique needs. These check-ins serve as opportunities to build rapport, identify underlying issues contributing to absenteeism, and provide personalized support.

**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. 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.

The identification of science performance as a crucial need is grounded in data-driven decision-making. The significant decline from 50% to 35% in science performance, as compared to the state's benchmark of 53%, underscores the urgency of this issue. Science proficiency is fundamental to a well-rounded education, impacting both academic achievement and future opportunities. While other subjects outperformed the state, the isolated decline in science performance necessitates focused attention to prevent further deterioration and align with the school's commitment to continuous improvement.

### 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 school year, CJM aims to increase science proficiency to a minimum of 60% of students performing at or above grade level, thus restoring performance to the 2021 level. This represents a targeted improvement from the baseline data of 35% proficiency observed in the 2022 academic year.

### Monitoring:

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

Monitoring science performance for the desired outcome of achieving a minimum of 50% of students performing at or above grade level will involve continuous data updates, regular comparisons with the target, and ongoing data review meetings. Interventions and instructional strategies will be tracked for effectiveness, while formative assessments and mid-year evaluations will assess individual student progress. Adjustments will be made as necessary, and progress reports will be transparently communicated to stakeholders, enabling data-driven decisions to ensure the goal is met by the end of the academic year.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kris Newman-Lake (knewmanlake@cypressjunction.org)

### 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.)

Two evidence-based interventions for improving science performance include student-centered learning, where students explore science topics of personal interest with guidance from teachers, fostering curiosity and self-directed learning. Additionally, multi-age collaboration and mentorship encourage older students to support and collaborate with younger peers in science projects, creating a cooperative learning community and aligning with Montessori's emphasis on peer learning and mentorship.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The selection of these specific strategies is grounded in a thoughtful consideration of evidence-based practices and their harmonious alignment with the Montessori philosophy. Student-centered learning, where students explore science topics of personal interest, was chosen to ignite curiosity and foster intrinsic motivation, a fundamental aspect of Montessori's belief in a child's natural inclination to discover and learn. Additionally, the implementation of multi-age collaboration and mentorship embraces Montessori's core principles of mixed-age classrooms and cooperative learning. This strategy allows older students to model enthusiasm, share their knowledge, and cultivate a sense of community and responsibility among peers, aligning perfectly with Montessori's emphasis on the importance of collaboration and peer support in the learning process. By blending evidence-based approaches with

Montessori ideals, these strategies aim to create a science learning environment that not only enhances performance but also nurtures holistic development and the innate curiosity of each student.

**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*

**Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

**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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

NA

**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.

Dissemination methods for the school improvement plan include the website, emails, PAC meetings, newsletters, social media, office copies, public forums, and staff meetings. The website is vital for accessibility, emails reach a broad audience, PAC meetings provide printed copies, newsletters offer

regular updates, social media shares information, office copies cater to physical preferences, public forums encourage feedback, and staff meetings ensure internal alignment, fostering transparency and engagement within the school community.

[www.cypressjunction.org/school-improvement-plan](http://www.cypressjunction.org/school-improvement-plan)

**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))

To cultivate positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders at CJM, evidence-based practices encompass the development of engagement programs, effective communication channels, and parent advisory committees. Providing educational workshops on Montessori principles, fostering community partnerships, and establishing volunteer programs enhance involvement. Implementing feedback mechanisms, practicing cultural sensitivity, and sharing student data for goal-setting ensure transparent communication, trust-building, and alignment with Montessori principles, ultimately supporting the school's mission, student needs, and the continuous flow of information to parents regarding their child's progress.

[www.cypressjunction.com/family-engagement-plan](http://www.cypressjunction.com/family-engagement-plan)

**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)**

To enhance the academic program at CJM, increase the quantity and quality of learning time, and offer an enriched and accelerated curriculum, CJM will align its academic content with Montessori philosophy while providing ongoing professional development for teachers. Extended learning opportunities and purposeful integration of technology should be balanced with hands-on experiences. The curriculum should include advanced Montessori materials and individualized learning plans for high-achieving students, and cross-age groupings can foster leadership and enrichment. Project-based learning, community involvement, and continuous assessment ensure a well-rounded approach, with monitoring of student progress for tailored support and challenge. These strategies collectively strengthen the school's academic program while honoring Montessori principles of personalized, experiential, and holistic education.

**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))**

NA

**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))**

We collaborate with a mental health facilitator provided by Polk County Public Schools. For our students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) who require counseling, we engage an external counselor to

offer specialized support. As a Montessori school, we prioritize the development of social and emotional skills in our students through practices such as grace and courtesy lessons, peace meetings, and peer counseling sessions.

**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))**

NA

**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).**

CJM has reading interventionists in K-8th grade to provide tiered interventions to our students. CJM's LEA Facilitator is also our MTSS coordinator ensuring all students in need of tiered intervention are getting those interventions and the data is being tracked appropriately. Based on data the MTSS Coordinator will refer the students to whatever additional services they may need such as IEP's and/or referral to our social worker. We also follow the PCPS progressive discipline and focus on restorative practices as opposed to exclusionary practices along with peace education as a Montessori school.

**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))**

At CJM, we've established a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, closely aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Our approach includes reading interventionists spanning PK-8th grade for tiered academic support. Our LEA Facilitator, who also serves as our MTSS coordinator, ensures effective coordination of interventions and meticulous data tracking. Using data insights, our MTSS Coordinator facilitates referrals, including IEPs, and collaborates with our social worker when students require additional socio-emotional support. We adhere to PCPS's progressive discipline framework, emphasizing restorative justice practices, creating a nurturing and inclusive school environment that respects the principles of IDEA while addressing both academic and behavioral needs comprehensively.

**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))**

CJM employs a range of strategies to facilitate a seamless transition for primary students (ages 3-6) into lower elementary classrooms (ages 6-9). These strategies align with Montessori principles and include orientation sessions, mixed-age classrooms, continuity of materials, skilled educators, community building, gradual introduction of new concepts, mentoring by older peers, individualized learning, open communication with parents, and ongoing assessment. By implementing these approaches, these schools create a supportive and nurturing environment that eases the transition process while maintaining the core tenets of Montessori education, fostering a sense of belonging and individualized learning.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                        | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

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

No