Citrus Ridge A Civics Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Citrus Ridge A Civics Academy

1775 SAND MINE RD, Davenport, FL 33897

http://citrusridge.polk-fl.net

Demographics

Principal: Nikeshia Leatherwood

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Polk 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.

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.

Table of Contents

Citrus Ridge A Civics Academy

1775 SAND MINE RD, Davenport, FL 33897

http://citrusridge.polk-fl.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Citrus Ridge is committed to engaging and developing Pioneers in a supportive environment designed with a focus on:
Community
Inclusion
Variety
Innovation
Collaboration
Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Citrus Ridge is to develop productive citizens for an ever-changing global society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Leatherwood, Nikeshia	Principal	Administration serves as instructional leaders by setting clear goals, managing resources, monitoring planning, professional development and instruction, and regularly supporting and evaluating teachers to promote student growth and learning. Creating a vision of student-centered learning focused on quality of instruction is one of the main priority for administrators at Citrus Ridge.
Mullenix, Melissa	Instructional Technology	Administrative support staff assist administrators in making decisions to govern the school through shared decision making.
Dyer, Jeni	Assistant Principal	Administration serves as instructional leaders by setting clear goals, managing resources, monitoring planning, professional development and instruction, and regularly supporting and evaluating teachers to promote student growth and learning. Quality of instruction is the main priority for administrators.
Evans, Joseph	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches help maintain a focus on learning and continuous improvement through data analysis. This data guides the work of collaborative teams and professional learning communities. Instructional coaches also support and monitor the work of collaborative teams and serve as the stewards of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Instructional coaches monitor achievement and climate and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals. Instructional coaches also identify gaps in performance or processes and plan for their improvement, aligning the school's work with the district's improvement goals.
Rankine-Colman, Renee	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches help maintain a focus on learning and continuous improvement through data analysis. This data guides the work of collaborative teams and professional learning communities. Instructional coaches also support and monitor the work of collaborative teams and serve as the stewards of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Instructional coaches monitor achievement and climate and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals. Instructional coaches also identify gaps in performance or processes and plan for their improvement, aligning the school's work with the district's improvement goals.
Echevarria, Martha	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches help maintain a focus on learning and continuous improvement through data analysis. This data guides the work of collaborative teams and professional learning communities. Instructional coaches also support and monitor the work of collaborative teams and serve as the stewards of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Instructional coaches monitor achievement and climate and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals. Instructional coaches also

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		identify gaps in performance or processes and plan for their improvement, aligning the school's work with the district's improvement goals.
Hinkle, Kenneth	Dean	Administrative support staff assist administrators in making decisions to govern the school through shared decision making.
Ruiz, Javier	Dean	Administrative support staff assist administrators in making decisions to govern the school through shared decision making.
Munoz, Yashira	School Counselor	Guidance counselors provide support and interventions for students' social-emotional needs and manage the MTSS process by providing a systemic process of monitoring student progression. Guidance counselors also manage teachers' data collection processes and reporting, reporting to the leadership team when academic or social decisions should be made for specific students. Counselors share findings and discussions from MTSS team data and decision making.
Keezer, Arynne	Teacher, ESE	The LEA representative is responsible for ensuring the implementation of each student's IEP, convening team meetings, continue with the IDEA process during certain disputes, document IEP implementation, evaluate students for services, and understand the key rules in the disciplinary process for students with disabilities.
Seay, Anthony	Instructional Technology	Administrative support staff assist administrators in making decisions to govern the school through shared decision making.
Clabough, Alexah	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches help maintain a focus on learning and continuous improvement through data analysis. This data guides the work of collaborative teams and professional learning communities. Instructional coaches also support and monitor the work of collaborative teams and serve as the stewards of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Instructional coaches monitor achievement and climate and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals. Instructional coaches also identify gaps in performance or processes and plan for their improvement, aligning the school's work with the district's improvement goals.
Davis, Karen	Assistant Principal	Administration serves as instructional leaders by setting clear goals, managing resources, monitoring planning, professional development and instruction, and regularly supporting and evaluating teachers to promote student growth and learning. Quality of instruction is the main priority for administrators.
Escalante, Gwendolyn	Teacher, ESE	The LEA representative is responsible for ensuring the implementation of each student's IEP, convening team meetings, continue with the IDEA

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		process during certain disputes, document IEP implementation, evaluate students for services, and understand the key rules in the disciplinary process for students with disabilities.
Gabel, Karen	School Counselor	Guidance counselors provide support and interventions for students' social-emotional needs and manage the MTSS process by providing a systemic process of monitoring student progression. Guidance counselors also manage teachers' data collection processes and reporting, reporting to the leadership team when academic or social decisions should be made for specific students. Counselors share findings and discussions from MTSS team data and decision making.
Godfrey, Victoria	School Counselor	Guidance counselors provide support and interventions for students' social-emotional needs and manage the MTSS process by providing a systemic process of monitoring student progression. Guidance counselors also manage teachers' data collection processes and reporting, reporting to the leadership team when academic or social decisions should be made for specific students. Counselors share findings and discussions from MTSS team data and decision making.
Williams, Diameshia	Assistant Principal	Administration serves as instructional leaders by setting clear goals, managing resources, monitoring planning, professional development and instruction, and regularly supporting and evaluating teachers to promote student growth and learning. Quality of instruction is the main priority for administrators.
Padron, Beronica	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches help maintain a focus on learning and continuous improvement through data analysis. This data guides the work of collaborative teams and professional learning communities. Instructional coaches also support and monitor the work of collaborative teams and serve as the stewards of the school's mission, vision, and core values. Instructional coaches monitor achievement and climate and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals. Instructional coaches also identify gaps in performance or processes and plan for their improvement, aligning the school's work with the district's improvement goals.
Ison, Sean	Other	As a Behavior Interventionist, this role supports students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral supports. This role focuses on reteaching behaviors and helping students make positive choices. Additionally, this role supports staff members who need supports in the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Nikeshia Leatherwood

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	143	181	137	212	191	189	273	261	0	0	0	0	1587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	33	35	36	30	21	33	6	20	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	8	3	4	5	10	24	22	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	32	37	66	63	0	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	30	45	64	70	0	0	0	0	222
December 2019 STAR ELA Level 1's	0	0	7	9	47	42	50	79	69	0	0	0	0	303
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1's	0	0	11	26	31	34	48	80	58	0	0	0	0	288

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	8	16	41	42	65	95	0	0	0	0	0	267

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	27	15	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	77
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/4/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	126	176	131	203	169	179	255	246	291	0	0	0	0	1776
Attendance below 90 percent	4	41	19	39	22	24	49	17	20	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	0	8	13	13	5	7	10	17	9	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	3	2	1	4	9	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	43	57	107	84	119	0	0	0	0	441

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	16	17	28	40	19	30	0	0	0	0	156

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	10	21	13	11	19	0	0	0	0	81
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	126	176	131	203	169	179	255	246	291	0	0	0	0	1776
Attendance below 90 percent	4	41	19	39	22	24	49	17	20	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	0	8	13	13	5	7	10	17	9	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	3	2	1	4	9	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	43	57	107	84	119	0	0	0	0	441

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	16	17	28	40	19	30	0	0	0	0	156

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	10	21	13	11	19	0	0	0	0	81
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	41%	61%	61%	39%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	58%	59%	41%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	54%	33%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	44%	61%	62%	34%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	59%	36%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	52%	31%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	33%	52%	56%	25%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	79%	78%	44%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(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.

	ELA					
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
05	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison	8%					
06	2019	34%	48%	-14%	54%	-20%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
07	2019	32%	42%	-10%	52%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	58%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	56%	-8%	62%	-14%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	56%	-4%	64%	-12%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	46%	51%	-5%	60%	-14%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	29%	47%	-18%	55%	-26%
	2018	25%	40%	-15%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
07	2019	30%	39%	-9%	54%	-24%
	2018	27%	40%	-13%	54%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	25%	35%	-10%	46%	-21%
	2018	16%	34%	-18%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	45%	-10%	53%	-18%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	24%	41%	-17%	48%	-24%
	2018	31%	42%	-11%	50%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	70%	5%	71%	4%
2018	75%	84%	-9%	71%	4%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	50%	43%	61%	32%
2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	53%	24%	57%	20%
2018	82%	41%	41%	56%	26%
Compare		-5%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	41	42	18	35	36	12	64			
ELL	26	50	50	32	51	51	26	64			
BLK	39	50	40	33	45	39	19	72			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	38	51	49	42	49	45	31	80	67		
MUL	37	39		26	30						
WHT	49	51	51	55	58	45	46	92	57		
FRL	36	48	47	38	47	40	26	78	45		

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	29	28	21	35	31	17				
ELL	27	47	33	27	41	35	21				
BLK	38	33	32	34	33	24	33				
HSP	34	44	35	36	45	38	35	73	77		
MUL	22	37		23	39		30				
WHT	51	48	33	58	55	39	58	95	81		
FRL	37	42	33	37	43	35	38	79	76		

2017 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	10	36	31	10	27	28	11	31			
ELL	18	26	26	19	33	34	8	20			
BLK	30	41	42	30	29	32	11	43			
HSP	34	35	29	27	34	29	18	43	37		
MUL	32	25		29	29						
WHT	51	52	42	45	41	36	41	46	34		
FRL	34	38	32	29	35	30	20	41	44		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	51
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	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	56
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	47
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.

The statewide science assessment scores showed the lowest performance at 33% of students reaching achievement level 3 or higher. This is a nine-point drop from 42% achievement last year. This is not a trend. Factors that may have contributed to this decline are lack of cognitively complex questions in instruction and practice and a focus on memorization, when only 1/5 of the test is lower level questions and about 80% of the assessment consists of moderately complex or high-complexity questions. Additional factors that may have contributed to this is novice teachers without solid instructional teaching strategies and methods for instructional delivery.

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

Acceleration showed the greatest decline from 79% (2018) to 59% (2019). Factors that contributed to this decline included 8th grade students not being properly scheduled into accelerated courses (Algebra I) who could have been. This was the largest factor because the EOC pass rates for the school were 93% (Algebra I) and 77% (Geometry).

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.

Science achievement and ELA achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The gap in science achievement was -23 for our school and the gap in ELA achievement was -20. Factors that contributed to this gap in science achievement are lack of complexity in practice questions used in classroom instruction. Factors that contributed to this gap for ELA achievement were a lack of alignment between instructional content and the learning maps, which are standards-based and aligned to focus standards targeted on the FSA; and insufficient time spent on integrating writing with reading.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile and Math Achievement showed the most improvement. In 2018, the gap between school and state scores in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was -17. In 2019, that gap was decreased to -6. This is an improvement of 11 points. During the 2018-19 school year, our school underwent an effort to provide differentiated instruction for all students and to rigorously implement a multi-tiered system of supports in which teachers provided supports and interventions at every level. In 2018, the gap between state and school math achievement was -19. In 2019, it was -8. This is an increase of 11 points as well. These results are not only the effect of our MTSS usage, but also the afterschool tutoring we were able to provide with Title I funds.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. The number of students who scored in Achievement Level 1 on state assessments in 2019 and the number of students showing Level 1 based on the December progressing monitoring data are potential areas of concern. Additionally, Students with Disabilities are not progressing at the same rate as students without disabilities in core academic areas.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Science Achievement
4. Increase School-wide Attendance
5. Reduce the Number of Suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards-aligned instruction was identified as an area of focus because it encompasses many factors that will lead to overall increased student achievement. Teachers must first understand the "intent" of the standards and then "teach" the standards in entirety without leaving out chunks of instruction. Instructional delivery must also be aligned to the standards so that "students" are exposed to the standards as outlined. Additionally, steps must be taken to ensure that instructional materials, aids, resources, assignments, engaging activities, discussions, group work, individual work, etc...are ALIGNED to the standards. Often, this area (target-task alignment) is where the disconnect (teaching and learning) occurs. When instructional leaders and staff understand the standards and how to select and vet materials accordingly, followed by implementation of effective teaching strategies with high-levels of student engagement (authentic and student-centered, not compliant), this gap will begin to close. This areas impacts student learning because as students are continually exposed to standards-aligned instruction where they authentically engage and "own" their learning, a by-product is increased learning. This learning will lead to higher-levels of achievement. This was identified as a critical need based on our current levels of achievement. Currently, we are achieving below 50% proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science. Though we are making gains in most areas, and have some areas that have exceeded this benchmark (50%), an increased focus may yield even higher results.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of standards-aligned instruction in core content areas,46% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state reading assessment; 49% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state mathematics assessment; and 38% of students will earn a 3, 4, or 5 on the state science assessment. All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored through reflective progress monitoring by all stakeholders (instructional leaders, instructional staff, and students).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikeshia Leatherwood (nikeshia.leatherwood@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Specific observables included in standards-aligned instruction, but are not limited to higher-order thinking questions embedded within lesson delivery, scaffolded support within core content areas, targeted (data-driven) small-group instruction, and reflective progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie's meta-analysis, high-effect size strategies were selected to improve learning outcomes. Progress monitoring produces teacher clarity in targeting student needs in small group instruction. Reflective progress monitoring will support awareness of goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy coaches, Mrs. Clabough and Mrs. Echevarria, math coaches, Mrs. Rankine-Colman and Mr. Evans, and science coach, Mrs. Padron will embed higher-order thinking questions into instruction during weekly instructional planning.
Coaches will:
* monitor lesson planning to ensure alignment with learning targets and state standards
* assist teachers in scaffolding questions from recall and application to analysis and synthesis level questions

* assist teachers in fluidly embedding these HOT questions into instruction through modeling and side-by-side coaching

Person Responsible   Alexah Clabough (alexah.clabough@polk-fl.net)

Instructional coaches Mrs. Clabough, Mrs. Echevarria, Mrs. Rankine-Colman, Mr. Evans, and Mrs. Padron will provide scaffolded support within core content areas along with instructional consumable supplies that are aligned with the Florida standards will help us to supplement general instruction with tasks and activities that target the individualized needs of students. Scaffolded support will also be provided in extended learning opportunities using these same instructional consumable supplies. Examples of these materials include but are not limited to: Studies Weekly, Time for Kids, and Ready Florida. Specific attention will be paid to those students in two ESSA categories: students with disabilities (SWD) and multiracial students. These supplementary materials will be specifically accommodate the needs of SWD per their IEP's.
* Coaches will preview materials in supplementary sources and match them to instruction in district learning maps
* Coaches will model and coach teachers on how to seamlessly integrate these supplementary materials

Person Responsible   Joseph Evans (joseph.evans@polk-fl.net)

Behavior interventionist, Sean Ison, instructional coaches Clabough, Echevarria, Evans, Padron, and Rankine-Colman will data and reflection to assist teachers in providing targeted (data-driven) small-group instruction. Online subscriptions to instructional technology such as Nearpod will allow teachers to use formative assessment data in real time to provide targeted small-group and even individualized instruction, both for remediation and enrichment. Provision of laptops and laptop carts makes this immediate access to data, for students and teachers, possible. In monthly PLC's, teachers will review classroom-specific behavior and academic reports, tier students, and plan instruction for remediation and/or enrichment. This will specifically assist students with disabilities and multiracial students having their specific behavioral and academic needs addressed.

Person Responsible   Beronica Padron (beronica.padron@polk-fl.net)

Behavior interventionist, Mr. Ison, instructional coaches Clabough, Echevarria, Evans, Padron, and Rankine-Colman, and school counselor, Mrs. Munoz will implement reflective progress monitoring monthly in PLC's. In monthly PLC's, teachers will review classroom-specific behavior and academic reports, tier students, and plan instruction for remediation and/or enrichment. This will specifically assist students with disabilities and multiracial students having their specific behavioral and academic needs addressed. Reflective progress monitoring allows teachers to reflect on their practice, resources, and methods, determine if they are effective and flexibly change if necessary. Providing substitutes for our English language arts teachers to create collaborative planning time will allow them to work collaboratively to score student progress monitoring essays, and plan for subsequent instruction.

Person Responsible   Martha Echevarria (martha.echevarria@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team intends to address two specific schoolwide improvement priorities, gaps in progress for students who scored Level 1 on state assessments and students with disabilities when compared to other subgroups or the school as a whole. The school leadership team will provide professional development, coaching, and support that will support teachers in providing small-group remediation in intensive classes and strategies for increasing student engagement. The school leadership team will also implement strategies to increase teacher academic engagement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Another school-wide improvement priority is establishing a positive and engaging learning environment and instilling a sense of community in our students and staff. Because our school is so large, this can seem to be an impossible task. In order to accomplish this task, we have divided our entire school into six houses. Each house contains students and staff from each grade level, K - 8. Within these houses, students and staff work together to earn points through our LiveSchool application for academic achievement, demonstrating positive behaviors, and acting in a spirit of service. A portion of our staff was trained in how to effectively implement a house system through professional development provided at The Ron Clark Academy in Atlanta, Georgia. We also hope to engage families in this system by allowing parents and families to earn points for their students' houses by participating in Parent and Family Engagement Events, such as the Annual Title I Night, Open House, etc. The use of student agendas as a communication tool will enhance the ability for parents/families and the school to communicate with one another, thus enhancing the positive school culture we are building.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00