

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Citrus Park Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Citrus Park Elementary School

7700 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Fonteyn

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Hillsborough 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Citrus Park Elementary School

7700 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

We will make our vision a reality by providing a school culture and community of SOAR:

- Be Safe
- Be Organized and Prepared
- Be An Active Learner
- Be Respectful

Provide the school's vision statement.

Citrus Park Elementary will soar as the district's leader in developing successful students.

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
Fonteyn, Chris	Principal	
Isajar, Jackie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Christopher Fonteyn

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.*

7

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	9	20	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	9	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/30/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	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	0	0	0	0

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	86	90	92	81	81	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	63%	52%	57%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	55%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	56%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	54%	63%	64%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	57%	62%	51%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	51%	33%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	47%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	55%	16%	58%	13%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
	2018	76%	54%	22%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	52%	20%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	43	60	48	42	51	44	44				
ELL	58	62		72	59		47				
ASN	87	77		93	85						
BLK	41	35		43	47		40				
HSP	58	63	59	64	63	42	50				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	74	69	58	81	65		69				
FRL	55	57	47	64	63	43	52				
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	50	46	31	53	60	47	55				
ELL	59	68	58	75	80						
ASN	81			81							
BLK	65	83		52	54						
HSP	62	68	61	68	80	61	71				
MUL	60	30		53	70						
WHT	81	75		78	77	58	84				
FRL	65	69	52	66	74	53	65				
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	36	52	53	49	41	27	27				
ELL	49	52	58	74	55		31				
ASN	75			100							
BLK	35	67		50	33						
HSP	55	54	56	60	49	41	39				
MUL	75	69		75	56		50				
WHT	70	47	40	65	52	25	58				
FRL	53	53	50	56	46	33	33				

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	59
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	61
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	86
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	41
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	58

Hispanic Students	
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	56
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.

This data is a year old. We are working on the premise of students being on e-learning for the fourth quarter of the year. We are building time into the schedule to tackle the probable deficiencies students may have.

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

This data is a year old. We are working on the premise of students being on e-learning for the fourth quarter of the year. We are building time into the schedule to tackle the probable deficiencies students may have.

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.

This data is a year old. We are working on the premise of students being on e-learning for the fourth quarter of the year. We are building time into the schedule to tackle the probable deficiencies students may have.

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

This data is a year old. We are working on the premise of students being on e-learning for the fourth quarter of the year. We are building time into the schedule to tackle the probable deficiencies students may have.

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

We as a school are concerned that the e-learning that occurred in the fourth quarter left students with deficiencies. Students engaged with the learning at different levels. We are expecting some students to be 9-12 weeks behind where they should have ended the school year.

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

1. Social Emotional Stability
2. Grade level reading proficiency
3. Grade level math proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students will be coming back to school after a quarter of e-learning. Students engaged at different levels at this time. Some students had little or no engagement leaving them 9-12 weeks behind their peers. Teachers will be generating standars covered in the fourth quarter and reviewing the students and their engagement. This information will be discussed with the 2020-2021 teachers. Depending on student needs, instruction will have to be modified to close the gap.

Measurable Outcome: Students will have to be assessed at the beginning of the year to gain a baseline. This will be done with i-Ready in math and reading as well as using the district end of the year math exam. From this data we will differentiate instruction to move students forward at least one year forward with our students who are significantly behind at least a year and a half.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: SIPPS
LAFS
Achieve 3000

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies focus on the individual student, taking them from where they are to where they need to be.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher will train in the various programs through PDS.
Teachers will utilize the strategies as shown in daily instructions.
Students will be measured to identify progress and trends.

Person Responsible Jackie Isajar (jaquelyn.isajar@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the School Climate and perception survey only 54% of students enjoy coming to school. Only 57% of students responded that students treat others with respect. Also: Students are returning from 9 weeks of e-learning due to Covid-19. In that time some have lost family members and there is a sense of fear, When people react out of fear they don't think rationally.

Measurable Outcome: Utilizing the School Climate and Perception Survey, each of those areas will increase to at least 75%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers and staff will be utilizing PBIS and Conscious Discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These specific strategies focus on positive behavior and building the capacity for dealing with disappointment, failure, and the unknown.

Action Steps to Implement

- Creating a PBIS/Conscious Discipline Team
- Training in PBIS/Conscious Discipline
- Setting guidelines, rewards, and protocols for behavior and expectations.

Person Responsible Marcy White (marcy.white@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We are working on the premise of students being on e-learning for the fourth quarter of the year. We are building time into the schedule to tackle the probable deficiencies students may have.

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.

The school has created a PBIS/Conscious Discipline Committee that reflects on past years behaviors and cultural challenges. Conscious Discipline focuses on helping the child regulate their emotions and giving them methods for dealing with life when they feel out of sorts. PBIS is a program in which the positive is recognized and rewarded in order to help facilitate a more positive environment.

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00