Cypress Woods Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Woods Elementary School

4900 CYPRESS WOODS BLVD, Palm Harbor, FL 34685

http://www.cypress-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Hill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2018-19 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	[Tracy Webley](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](http://www.floridacims.org)

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Teach It! Learn It! Live It!

Provide the school's vision statement

To achieve Cypress Woods Elementary's vision, we will prepare our students to become independent learners with the desires, the skills, and the abilities necessary for lifelong learning. This will require creating a learning environment which is centered around students, directed by teachers, and supported by home and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title
Hill, Kim	Principal
Principal	
Stevens, Christopher	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Dupree, Rachel	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Fleisch, Raylee	Instructional Media
Instructional Media	
Grasley, Stacy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Hardgrove, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Lau, Heidi	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Leto, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Maguire, Carolyn	Teacher, PreK
Teacher, PreK	
Mulligan, Mary	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Price, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Reisberg, Susan	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Rentz, Danelle	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Reyes, Jaclyn	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Slater, Nancy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Tracy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Tsetsekas, Deanna	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Tubergen, Karen	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Ubben, Amy	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	

Name	Title
Wilson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	98	114	114	126	122	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	11	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
38

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/17/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	15	16	21	19	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	54%	57%	75%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	59%	58%	67%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	56%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	83%	61%	63%	83%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%	61%	62%	73%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	64%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	76%	53%	53%	78%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	98 (0)	114 (0)	114 (0)	126 (0)	122 (0)	145 (0)	719 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	9 ()	11 ()	7 ()	9 ()	8 ()	44 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	19 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	84%	56%	28%	58%	26%
	2018	75%	53%	22%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	56%	25%	58%	23%
	2018	82%	51%	31%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
	2018	72%	50%	22%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	60%	18%
	2018	84%	61%	23%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	47	56	53	57	59	65	39				
ELL	83	73		92	73						
ASN	85			85							
BLK	55			64							
HSP	78	80		78	73	40	79				
MUL	82	67		76	75						
WHT	81	72	63	85	77	64	76				
FRL	64	71	60	78	71	60	59				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	34	45	46	43	52	42	40				
ELL	71	75		87	62						
ASN	88	92		94	69						
BLK	50			50							
HSP	80	65		86	71		100				
MUL	77			77							
WHT	74	64	52	84	73	63	76				
FRL	58	59	52	72	66	57	78				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	79
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

School Grade data component low performance - L25 Math Gains - 59% (2018-19)
Trends - 64% (17/18) to 59% (18/19)
*Contributing factor to our lowest performance is the decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule.

ESSA data component, low performance - SWD - 54% (2018-19)
Trends - 43% (17/18) to 54% (18/19)
*Identified factors of decreased collaboration between general educational and VE teachers, including differentiation of instructional practices within classrooms. This was identified as an area for growth after the 17/18 school year. Practices were changed for the 18/19 school year and we have seen an 11% gain from our SWDs. Practices included - targeted ELP groups to include VE Resource teachers, data chats that included VE teachers and general education teachers, and support from district ESE staff developer.

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

5th Grade FSA Math Data - 84% (17/18)to 78% (18-19) - 6% decline.
*Contributing factors to our lowest performance are the decrease in instructional minutes allocated to the master schedule, intentional planning for highly complex tasks, targeted ELP instruction for L25 students in the area of math.

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

Cypress Woods data was above district and state averages for all subjects.

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

FSA ELA L25 data - 56% (17/18) to 63% (18/19)
*New actions for the 2018-19 school year included focused ELP groups for ELA instruction, increased grade level data chats, and optimizing testing environments for student assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

After reflecting on EWS data, we have 9 students with two or more potential areas of concern. These students will be monitored through our MTSS, child study team, and data chats with teachers.

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

1. L25 Math Learning Gains
2. Science Proficiency
3. SWD Proficiency and Learning Gains
4. Targeted Intervention and Enrichment Block for K-5

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA/Reading
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 80%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA results. The gap is occurring because students need to interact with standards based instruction. If teachers intentionally plan for target/task alignment based on grade level standards growth would occur, the problem would be reduced by an increase in student scores.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 80% to 85%, as measured by 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen staff depth of knowledge to engage students in a progression of standards based content that leads to higher task complexity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students need more exposure to cognitively complex task as that ties into current district and state initiatives in ELA. An emphasis on standards based tasks that progress in complexity, will increase the learning gains of all students as well as increase overall proficiency.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers need to intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Webb's/Marzano taxonomy and adjust instruction through talk, task, text and student needs 2. Teachers intentionally design lessons on a progression of difficulty with multiple checkpoints to find what students know and then adapt instruction to meet the student's needs. 3. Fidelity of phonics instruction in primary grades. 4. Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade level texts and apply foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. 5. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one to one instruction. 6. Monitor ELA instruction using observational data with targeted feedback.
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 83%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA Mathematics Data. The gap is occurring because of lack of planning for highly complex tasks. If teachers plan for cognitively complex tasks that differentiate for remediation and enrichment, the problem would be reduced by 3%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 83% to 86%, as measured by 2020 Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use a progression of mathematical tasks to build to the implementation of cognitively complex tasks to improve critical thinking skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Cognitively Complex Tasks develop a higher level of complex thinking and help students to develop mathematical sense in the real world. Administrators will use the Marzano Framework instructional tool to evaluate the level of implementation: not using, developing, applying or innovating. Administrators will provide feedback through iobservation.

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure that rigorous student-centered instruction occurs daily throughout all classrooms. 2. Utilize mathematical resources including Ready Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, math tools, and academic games to engage all mathematical learners. 3. Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs. 4. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment. Data includes unit assessments, exit tickets, MAP, MFAS, and illustrative mathematics. 5. Implement a progression of mathematical tasks that lead to cognitively complex tasks that help develop critical thinking skills.
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 76%, as evidenced in 2019 Florida Science Standards Assessment . The gap is occurring because there is a need to review areas of deficiencies with third and fourth grade science standards met by 5th grade students. If routines were established to review proficiency data from 3rd and 4th grade science standards, there would be a 5% increase in SSA scores by 5th grade students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 76% to 81%, as measured by 2020 SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing ELA and Science data to scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student, which will involve ESE and ELP instructional support staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Comparing FSA ELA data with SSA Science data we noticed a direct correlation between the Level 1 and 2 ELA scores and the Level 1 and 2 science scores. 65% of the 5th graders who scored a level one or two on ELA also scored a Level one or two in Science.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer the science diagnostic assessment to all 5th graders in September to get baseline data. 2. Continue administering unit assessments and identify low performing standards and add to review plan. 3.Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th grade diagnostic assessment. 4. Collaborate with 3rd-4th grade teachers, ELA and ESE instructional support staff to develop and implement meaningful content driven learning tasks including vocabulary and reading strategies explicit to science using One Note Class Notebook and PLC conversations. 5. Administer diagnostic test again in January to see what deficiencies remain to adjust instructional shifts that need to occur.
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging The Gap/Black Student Achivement
Rationale	Our current level of performance is ELA 56%, Math 67%, as evidenced in FSA Proficiency.. The problem/gap is occurring because the lack of culturally relevant instruction and participation in school-based enrichment programs.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students proficient in ELA and Math will increase from 56% in ELA and 67% in Math to 80% in both ELA and Math as measured by 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If increased participation in enrichment and remediation activities would occur, there would be an increase in proficiency in ELA and Math.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide "Just in Time" training on creating culturally responsive lessons and interventions. 2. Encouraging black students to participate in enrichment activities 3. Ensure that black students have opportunities for recognition of academic achievement. 4. Analyze formative assessment data for black students to identify opportunities for intervention.
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate/Conditions For Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 20 referrals, 17 students receiving referrals. We expect our performance level to be a decrease in referrals by May 2020.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving referrals will decrease by 1% as evidenced by restorative practices research from IIRP.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students. Implement the engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students need positive relationships to allow them to access, engage and express learning in the classroom.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administration and committee members will develop and implement a cohesive plan for documenting behavior and teacher strategies prior to referrals being given. 2. Continue school-wide roll-out and development plan of RP/SEL to improve school climate and culture. 3. Built in equity training's throughout the year with more equity champions supporting teachers after training's 4. Teachers will be supported in utilizing 6 M's in lesson planning and instruction. 5. Review student and teacher data with staff quarterly and collect teacher input.
Person Responsible	Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate for all students is 95.8% as evidenced by student attendance data in School Profiles. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because inconsistent follow up with processes when addressing chronic student absences and family vacations taken during instructional time.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 8% to 5%, as measured by student attendance data in School Profiles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If follow through on absence processes and procedures would occur, the number of students missing more than 10% of school would be reduced by 3%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a biweekly basis. 3. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness. 4. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	Current data shows Cypress Woods has over 11,000 volunteer hours logged as evidenced in Focus. We have 55 business and community partners and over 70 adopt-a-class partners. We also have 10 trained mentors/lunch pals mentoring 18 students in need as evidenced by the number of trained mentors scheduled to work with students. A recognized gap is the under reported volunteer hours logged into Focus and the lack of available and trained mentors/lunch pals to mentor our students in need. If we had additional mentors/lunch pals we could match more of our students with mentors/lunch pals.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students receiving mentor/lunch pal support will increase from 18 to 28 as measured by the number of mentors scheduled to meet with students and logged hours in Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	If we recruited business and community partners to be trained as mentors/lunch pals and offered an on site mentoring workshop, we would increase the number of students paired for mentoring support by 10 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure we develop a process for registered volunteers to log their volunteer hours into Focus. Work with the Office of Community Partnerships to schedule an on site mentoring workshop so we are able to recruit new mentors/lunch pals to work with more students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Develop a process to remind registered volunteers to log hours into Focus. 2. Compile a list of students who would benefit from mentoring support. 3. Recruit business and community partners to become trained mentors. 4. Offer on site mentoring workshop for recruited mentors. 5. Develop a schedule for trained mentors to support students weekly.
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 2 out of 8 modules, as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will be eligible in 3 out of 6 modules to be recognized by April 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide "Just in in Time" training for teachers needing support in Health Education, based on data from the Healthy Schools Program Assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because lack of professional development in health education. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness would occur, the problem would be reduced by our school having a greater opportunity to be eligible for recognition .

Action Step	
Description	1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student. 2. Attend district-supported professional development 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan 5. All staff will participate in Kognito mental health training
Person Responsible	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading				$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			6261 - Cypress Woods Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00
			Notes: TDEs to support professional development for instructional staff in all content areas.			
			6261 - Cypress Woods Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Materials and staff to support intervention and enrichment for all students			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging The Gap/Black Student Achivement**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions For Learning**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			6261 - Cypress Woods Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		$200.00
			Notes: Restorative Practice trainer license for two staff			
			6261 - Cypress Woods Elementary Schl			$300.00
			Notes: Incentives and resources for PBIS			
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$4,000.00**