

Orange County Public Schools

Citrus Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Citrus Elementary

87 N CLARKE RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://citrus.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Mary Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 2/17/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Orange 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	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Citrus Elementary

87 N CLARKE RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://citrus.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">98%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">87%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Walker, Robert	Principal	Mr. Robert Walker (Principal) serves as the building level administrator. Mr. Walker provides a common vision; with a focus on standards-based instruction, data-based decision making, and providing systems of support for instructional staff to ensure the success and well-being of all students.
Holley, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Holley assists the principal in providing guidance and leadership to teachers and staff members. She conducts classroom walk-throughs as well as monitors trends and frequency in an effort to ensure standards-based practices are occurring and to pinpoint areas of need. Mrs. Holley develops and evaluates the schools core curriculum and content programs to determine effectiveness and appropriateness of evidence-based interventions and differentiated teaching strategies. Mrs. Holley facilitates weekly PLC meetings in order to promote team collaboration and to analyze and disaggregate student data. She also supervises and evaluates personnel in terms of their performance and responsibilities to support the school-wide goals.
Jackson, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Deborah Jackson leads planning for all core content areas, provides professional development, locates resources for teams, creates grade level formative assessments, develops standards based scales with student evidence, meets weekly with PLC's during common planning meetings, and coaches teachers on effective instructional strategies.
Orouke, Lisa	Staffing Specialist	Lisa O'Rourke assists the MTSS team in identifying at-risk students and developing appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions. She assists with properly matching interventions or strategies to support student achievement. In addition, she schedules and facilitates IEP, 504, and ELL meetings with the respective stakeholders.
St. Onge, Daniel	Instructional Coach	Daniel St. Onge supports teachers with planning for Math and Science, provides professional development, locates resources for teams, creates grade level formative assessments, develops standards based scales with student evidence.
Nelson, Jessica	Attendance/Social Work	Jessica Nelson assists with monitoring of attendance and truancy, schedules Child Study Team meetings, and completes social history as needed as part of the MTSS process.
Harrison, Katie	Behavior Specialist	Katie Harrison is responsible for assisting Student Support personnel with school wide behavior expectations. Provides support to the self-contained EBD unit and Pre-K ASD unit, is a member of the MTSS team, helps teachers set up behavior plans, and helps teachers with the collection of behavior data.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stodolak, Cindy	School Counselor	Cindy Stodolak is the school's Guidance Counselor. Her primary role is to implement and maintain a comprehensive, schoolwide counseling program, to include SEL support for teachers, and individual or small group counseling for students. Additionally, Ms. Stodolak leads the Threat Assessment Team, meeting monthly to support students in need. Ms. Stodolak is the school's McKinney-Vento contact/coordinator, a member of the CST team, is the suicide ideation and Baker Act contact, and supports school-wide behavior plans, as well as individual behavior modification plans.
Payne, Tiffany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Tiffany Payne is the school's Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT). She supports teachers in implementing and monitoring assessments such as i-Ready Diagnostic, CRM common formative assessments, Florida Standards Assessment, ACCESS testing, and EOC exams. Ms. Payne is also the school's MTSS coordinator. She implements and monitors school-wide MTSS practices, assesses its productivity, identifies appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions and assists teachers in identifying both academic and behaviorally at-risk students. She supports new and experienced teachers with curriculum resources and provides mentor support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/17/2020, Mary Clark

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

501

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	11	70	72	94	76	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	2	17	14	16	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	1	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

2020-21 - 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	19	61	97	89	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	9	19	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	19	61	97	89	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	9	19	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				56%	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	58%	58%	45%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	53%	37%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	63%	63%	64%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	61%	62%	48%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	48%	51%	33%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	56%	53%	58%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The i-Ready diagnostic was used to capture student data in grades 1-5 for ELA and Math. The PMA was used to capture student data in grade 5 for Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	56	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	42	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	33	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	31	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	22	31
	Students With Disabilities	25	0	0
	English Language Learners	22	0	17

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	42	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	21	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	4	15	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	28	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	11	15
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	4	7	7

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	45	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	12	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	14
	English Language Learners	8	15	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	25	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	8	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	17
	English Language Learners	4	12	27

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	35	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	18	19
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	10
	English Language Learners	8	12	8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	36	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	10	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	10
	English Language Learners	4	8	28
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	39	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	13	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	35	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	15	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	7	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	52	34	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	28	50
	Students With Disabilities	17	0	0
	English Language Learners	38	0	36

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8			8							
ELL	25	33		38	36		7				
ASN	69			75							
BLK	35	39	29	37	33	13	39				
HSP	24	31		27	8		38				
WHT	54	61		53	47		39				
FRL	34	48	50	35	35	31	30				
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	12	35	38	21	45	46					
ELL	37	53	44	36	47	47	31				
ASN	76	64		76	82						
BLK	54	60	34	55	49	41	46				
HSP	56	65	57	55	49	29	48				
WHT	59	58		61	53		52				
FRL	48	56	43	51	52	32	34				
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	26	27	42	42	27					
ELL	27	37	29	36	37	29					
ASN	89	67		78	73						
BLK	50	46	45	60	41	32	42				
HSP	54	36	25	63	53	31	50				
WHT	66	47		68	42	30	76				
FRL	57	46	38	64	48	33	58				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	8
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Current trends across grade levels show that overall proficiency increased from BOY to EOY in ELA by 18%, it increased in Math by 27%, and it increased in Science by 5%. When taking a deeper look, it is apparent that our students with disabilities data trended downward in all subject areas across grade levels 1, 2, and 5. In ELA these grade levels made 0% growth. In 1st grade Math showed a decrease in performance of 25% and in 5th grade Science there was a decrease of 17%. Meanwhile in 2nd and 5th grade Math there was 0% growth.

Our students who fall in the economically disadvantaged subgroup increased their performance in all subject areas across all grade levels. Our ELL students in grade 1 showed a decrease in performance of 33% in ELA and 0% growth was made in 4th grade. Additionally, in Math our ELL students made a 0% growth in 1st grade and only a 2% increase in 5th grade Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are our students with disabilities and our ELL students. In grades 1, 2, and 5 in all assessed subject areas (ELA, Math, and Science) the students with disabilities either showed a decrease in performance on the EOY diagnostic or made a 0% increase. In grade 1 Math, grade 4 ELA, and grade 5 Math the ELL students either showed a decline in performance or made a 0% increase.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

These factors can be contributed to a lack of monitoring and support provided to this subgroup of students. Going forward we are adopting the Inclusive Scheduling method which requires the ESE teacher to push into the classroom to provide targeted instruction and support to the students with disabilities. A similar model will be used to support the ELL students in which the ELL paraprofessionals will provide push in support during the FBS block. The ESE teacher and ELL paraprofessionals will be required to participate in professional development focused on best practices and instructional strategies. They will also be responsible for progress monitoring their students to determine the effectiveness of the support being provided.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement was in the areas of students who are categorized as economically disadvantaged and in overall proficiency. These students showed an increase in performance in all subject areas ELA, Math, and Science.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to these improvements were an increase in the usage of Reflex Math, Study Island, and the integration of Reading Plus in which students progress was monitored and incentivized. In addition to the implementation of these programs' adjustments were made to the instructional support staff, assessment mapping was introduced, and Tier 3 pull out support was provided by the leadership team.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate student learning we will continue with the measures put into place last year while placing an intense focus on student data trends, progress monitoring, consistently conducting classroom walk throughs, participating in common planning, hosting bi-weekly data meetings, conducting student data chats, strategic student placement, hosting enrichment clubs, and providing acceleration via tutoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning teachers and staff members will be provided with professional development opportunities centered around small group instruction, best practices for tier 2 interventions, collaborative teaching, and ELL strategies.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The addition of an assistant principal and four tier 1 intervention teachers to the current staff will enhance support for all grade levels and lead to an increase in student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Progress monitoring data from the 2020-21 school year indicates that there is an achievement gap between the ESSA SWD subgroup and their mainstream counterparts. Focusing on increasing the learning gains of the SWD will lead to an increase of overall proficiency in both ELA and Math which help to reduce the achievement gap evident within this population of students.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to increase the SWD ELA proficiency from 14% to 25% and increase their Math proficiency from 18% to 25%.
 1. Inclusive scheduling and collaborative teaching will be implemented in order to provide more specific and targeted standards-based instruction for our SWD during small group time in ELA and Math.

Monitoring: 2. Teachers and the MTSS team will increase monitoring student progress through the use of i-Ready diagnostics, progress monitoring assessments, tiered interventions, and classroom assessments. Classroom observations will be conducted to ensure teachers are using differentiated instruction to meet needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will implement differentiated, small group instruction based on multiple sources of data and track student progress proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By implementing inclusive scheduling and focusing on our system of analyzing data, we will be able to align effective instructional strategies with individual student needs, hence improving learning for our SWD and our general education students.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership team will participate in targeted weekly instructional Tier 3 pull out groups.

Person Responsible Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Teachers will participate in professional developments to assist with the implementation of small groups, best practices, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

Instructional Coach will provide professional development on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to plan for and provide differentiated instructional strategies to meet the needs of our SWD.

Person Responsible Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

Teachers will participate in data meetings to analyze data from formative and summative assessments, and tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

The MTSS team will monitor student progress using i-Ready progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments, and data gathered during intervention.

Person Responsible Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

The Instructional Coach and MTSS team will support teachers in designing differentiated learning tasks and model strategies as needed.

Person Responsible Courtney Holley (courtney.holley@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will continue to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Research shows that academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

1. ESSA Subgroup SWD proficiency
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Decreasing the number of students with attendance below 90%

Measurable Outcome: We plan to increase the overall proficiency in ELA from 46% to 55%.

Monitoring: We will use the Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data and i-Ready data to monitor the desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to use distributive leadership in conjunction with social and emotional learning to strengthen our team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. We will continue to plan and implement cycles of professional learning that will provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. The impact of our professional learning will be monitored and measured through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to develop, implement, and monitor instructional strategies that connect to social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible: Cindy Stodolak (cindy.stodolak@ocps.net)

Continue to develop, implement, and monitor professional learning that integrates academics and social emotional learning.

Person Responsible: Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: As measured by the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment, data has indicated only a total of 43% of students at Citrus Elementary scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome: The growth goal for the 2022 FSA ELA is 13%, increasing our percentage of level 3 or higher from 43% to 56%.

Monitoring: Monitoring for the measurable outcome will occur through multiple points of data. i-Ready diagnostics occur each quarter and is monitored by coaches and administration. Classroom walk-throughs occur each week, are strategic based on accumulated data, and are conducted by coaches and administration. District common assessments are monitored weekly, or upon data release, by coaches and administration. SIPPS mastery and SIPPS fluency assessments are administered on a bi-weekly basis through intervention for our Tier II and Tier III students. This data is gathered and monitored on a weekly basis by coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: An evidence-based strategy being implemented is SIPPS for Tier III intervention instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SIPPS teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. SIPPS is an evidence-based program that has a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. The selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

- Ensure intervention time is planned accordingly.
- Walk-To-Intervention plan to be followed.
- Students are grouped according to i-Ready instructional grouping profiles.
- Coaches provide evidence-based resource materials to teachers.
- Monitor SIPPS fluency and SIPPS mastery bi-weekly data.
- Maintain fluidity in grouping assignments based on regular data.

Person Responsible Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The Child Study Team (consisting of the guidance counselor, registrar, assistant principal, and social worker) will monitor school-wide student attendance on a monthly basis by reviewing the number of absences and tardies for each class on each grade level. The Child Study Team will conduct parent conferences with parents of students that have frequent absences and tardies to develop a plan for on time and consistent attendance.

Citrus Elementary School's discipline data ranks very high in the category of violent incidents therefore this is a primary area of concern. We will develop a healthy and positive climate and environment by implementing the PBIS model for discipline. Within this model we will recognize our students for the positive behaviors they exhibit daily not only in the classroom but on the entire campus by teaching them how to behave appropriately and rewarding them for doing so.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teacher and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determination next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. These individuals include but aren't limited to students, families, teachers, community partners, the Parent Teacher Association, and the School Advisory Council.