

Citrus County Schools

Lecanto Primary School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto Primary School

3790 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lps.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Mollie Chandler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Citrus 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto Primary School

3790 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lps.citruschools.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Citrus 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.

In connection with its children, families, and community, LPS promises to provide quality instruction, a challenging learning environment, and a lasting partnership to create life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bringing inspiration and innovation to every student!

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
Lofton, Vicki	Principal	Lead staff, students, and families to strong levels of achievement.
Baize, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal in leading the school community to high levels of success.
Bowman, Shennen	School Counselor	Counseling, teaching social skills, mental health, assist families in need with outside agencies, attendance, support to teachers with struggling students, support students with challenging behaviors with teaching replacement behaviors.
Collins, Debi	Staffing Specialist	ESE Specialist, assist in the identification and support of students with special needs.
Loreth, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Assisting teachers in all academic areas, coaching/modeling instructional methods and strategies, analyzing student achievement for the purpose of assisting teachers to better reach the needs of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Mollie Chandler

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.*

3

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

780

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

3

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

7

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	123	118	122	127	115	163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	17	23	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	4	10	9	9	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	5	10	11	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	6	12	19	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	32	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	5	15	15	29	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	5	6	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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

Monday 9/20/2021

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	88	90	92	78	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	8	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	4	9	3	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	5	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	88	90	92	78	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	8	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	4	9	3	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	5	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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				57%	59%	57%	55%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	51%	50%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	48%	53%	37%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	60%	63%	66%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	54%	62%	63%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	39%	51%	36%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	60%	53%	56%	61%	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	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We utilized iReady Diagnostic Assessment data to progress monitor student achievement.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	20	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	12	35
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	1
	English Language Learners	1	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	21	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	11	43
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	5
	English Language Learners	1	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	30	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	10	17
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	22	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	8	30
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	6
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	43	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	19	32
	Students With Disabilities	3	2	3
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	16	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	5	25
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	42	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	22	30
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	3
	English Language Learners	1	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	29	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	15	44
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	26	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	15	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	31	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	17	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	16	23	31	18	35	27	12				
ASN	73			82							
BLK	50			40							
HSP	54	45		45	46		42				
WHT	55	40	31	58	58	50	47				
FRL	49	41	35	53	52	38	43				
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	15	21	30	18	11	5					
ELL	36			55							
HSP	62	56		62	56		55				
MUL	30			27							

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
WHT	58	50	35	61	52	33	60				
FRL	55	49	33	53	45	31	55				
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	35	29	27	27	11	23				
HSP	62	56		68	76						
MUL	64			57							
WHT	54	52	38	66	60	33	58				
FRL	49	49	36	61	58	35	51				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	78
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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	48
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Our percentage of iReady spring diagnostic data for ELA, 3rd through 5th grade, fell below the 70% target, with 5th grade being the lowest at 41%. This is similar in comparison to the FSA, 3rd through 5th below the 70% target, with 5th grade being the lowest at 50% level 3 or above. Data carried forward for subgroups include Multiracial and SWD below the 41% target.

FSA ELA Learning gains was at 41% (decline from 2019 data) but lowest quartile had a 1% increase from 2019 data.

In Math, iReady spring diagnostic data, 3rd through 5th grade show 4th grade reaching target at 71%, 3rd grade at 50% and 5th grade at 47%. FSA data mirrors the data with 5th grade at the lowest with 54% levels 3 and above.

FSA Math Learning gains increased from 51% in 2019 to 54% in 2021. And the lowest quartile learning gains also increased from 32% to 42%.

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

ELA across all grade levels and Science in 5th grade are our greatest need. Additionally, subgroups SWD and Multicultural are in need of improvement.

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

Our low social-economic community have demonstrated high degree of social emotional needs. This together with the pandemic, interrupted or inconsistent quality instruction, and overall societal challenges have all contributed to this need for improvement.

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

Fourth grade ELA FSA scores showed a 6% increase in comparison to 2019 data, both above district and state averages. Additionally, lowest quartile learning gains for ELA showed a 1% increase from the 2019 to 2021 data.

In Math, FSA scores showed a 1% gain in 3rd grade and a 1% gain in FSA learning gains. In learning gains we realized a 3% increase and in the lowest quartile math learning gains we realized a 10% gain.

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

Consistent and frequent data analysis and reflection, progress monitoring plans for those who qualify, consistency in math instruction as well as supplemental programs, and the use of iReady to target areas of deficit and MAFS to provide rigorous supplemental instruction.

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

Implementation of BEST Standards
Continued implementation of iReady
Implementation of Lexia Core 5 Intervention program
Continued implementation of social-emotional learning & counseling

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.

Professional development for
BEST Standards
Wonders Curriculum
PLC for Social Emotional Learning

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

Professional Development for new teachers each year will continue to focus on our School Improvement focus areas so to ensure sustainability. Instructional coach will continue to work with teachers who need assistance with implementation of focus area strategies. Data Days and collaboration will continue to focus on areas of success as well as areas for improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase the achievement levels for ELA by 10 percentage points. FSA data indicated 54% of students 3-5 scored a 3 or above on 2021 FSA with 33% of bottom quartile of students making learning gains. Specifically, grade 3 scored 59%, 4th grade 56% and Fifth grade at 50% levels 3 and above. When reviewing the reading clusters, we note that Integration of Knowledge and Ideas as well as Key Ideas and Details appear the lowest scoring areas. When reviewing Achievement Gaps between our SWD students, we find a 49 percentage point GAP, indicating a need there as well. Additionally, iReady data indicates a need for attention and focus in ELA in grades K, 2, and 5 as well.

Measurable Outcome: Achievement levels, learning gains, and bottom quartile will increase achievement by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by iReady Diagnostic Assessments, Citrus Assessment, 3rd Grade Portfolio and Accelerated Reader data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Wonders Reading Curriculum, iReady, Lexia Core 5 Intervention Program, and Independent Reading (Accelerated Reader) are strategies that will be used for gaining improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In addition to our Wonders curriculum, BEST Standards, and iReady supplement, we know that our students demonstrate a need to build their reading stamina and the love of reading. According to the research, students need time to apply specific reading skills independently. In addition, students benefit from exposure to varying genres and topics of interest. "Independent reading helps students increase reading comprehension, vocabulary growth, spelling, understanding of grammar, and knowledge of the world." When reviewing FSA data, the area of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas indicates our greatest need with Key Ideas and Details a close second. School Improvement Planning team identified these researched based strategies as helpful to meet our goals.

Action Steps to Implement

- Implement Wonders Reading Curriculum
- Increase independent reading utilizing Accelerated Reader
- Continued use of iReady
- Collaboration, Vertical Planning, and Data Monitoring
- A before school tutoring lab will be available for identified students of need.

Person Responsible: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>FSA data and iReady data indicate this to be a need for improvement.</p> <p>In Math, iReady spring diagnostic data, show 4th grade reaching target at 71%, 3rd grade at 50% and 5th grade at 47%. FSA data mirrors the data with 5th grade at the lowest with 54% levels 3 and above.</p> <p>FSA Math Learning gains increased from 51% in 2019 to 54% in 2021. And the lowest quartile learning gains also increased from 32% to 42%.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Achievement levels, learning gains, and bottom quartile will increase achievement by 10 percentage points.
Monitoring:	iReady data, Lexia Core 5 for interventions, and district assessments will provide us data to assist us to reach our desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady, Go Math, MAFS and iReady Tool Box will be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School Improvement Planning team reviewed all data, analyzed resources currently being utilized, and agreed upon these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue the use of GoMath, MAFS, and iReady Toolbox
 Improve fact fluency
 Utilize vertical planning to identify and develop foundational/high impact skills at each grade level
 Collaboration, data monitoring, and instructional coaching.
 Focus on instruction addressing Operations, Algebraic Thinking, and Fractions as this was our lowest area for 5th grade.

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus According to the 19-20 data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site, Lecanto Primary reported 1.5 incidents per 100 students while the state average was 1.0 per 100.

Description and Rationale: We have initiated a behavior committee and created a plan that includes a focus of social-emotional learning. Professional development, use of a reset room, brain breaks, focus tools, counseling, and PMPs to support students are part of the plan. Discipline data and survey input (Staff, Parent, and Student).

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to decrease discipline incidents by 10%.

Monitoring: Discipline calls resulting in office referrals are monitored daily, reported in staff newsletter monthly, and discussed during quarterly behavior committee meetings. Additionally, data will be shared with School Advisory Council.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony, Second Step, PLC for Social- Emotional Learning, PBIS, Crisis Prevention Intervention training, and small group counseling with school counselor, school psychologist, and social worker. Additionally, work with outside agencies for additional therapy opportunities for identified students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School Improvement Planning team reviewed all discipline data and staff, parent, and student surveys as well as the current resources utilized. They identified the needs and agreed upon these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- Share discipline data with staff monthly
- Quarterly data reports
- Sanford Harmony, Second Step, Small Group Counseling
- School-based Behavior Specialist
- PBS including Positive Referrals and use of the Morning Show
- Behavior Committee quarterly meetings

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Subgroup identified: SWD according to the 2019 & 2021 data
 Subgroup identified: Multi-racial according to the 2019 data

Measurable Outcome: Achievement levels, learning gains, and bottom quartile will increase achievement by 10 percentage points for both subgroups SWD and Multi-racial.

Monitoring: We will monitor iReady data as well as district assessments. iReady Data meetings will take place monthly and collaboration sessions focused on analyzing data will take place weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement ELA BEST standards, Wonders Reading Curriculum, Lexia Core 5 Intervention program, small group instruction, and iReady.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based upon our School Improvement Planning meeting and Literacy committee, we have identified the above strategies to assist us in our implementation plan for improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

- Implement Wonders Reading Curriculum
- Implement ELA Best Standards
- Increase independent reading utilizing Accelerated Reader
- Continued use of iReady
- Lexia Core 5 Intervention program
- Collaboration, Vertical Planning, and Data Monitoring

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: FSA data of 5th grade Science scores indicated 44% of the students scored at 3% or above. An analysis of the content areas indicated that Nature of Science and Life Sciences were the specific areas of concern.

Measurable Outcome: Achievement levels will increase achievement by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring: Through weekly collaboration sessions, teachers will monitor science test scores based upon the Science curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of BEST Standards, small group instruction with students who are struggling based upon science test scores, Lesson Study and Vertical planning as well as data days to analyze problem areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School Improvement Planning group (including representation from School Advisory Council) identified the need for implementation of BEST ELA Standards specifically comprehension which may effect comprehension of science material, vertical planning and lesson study approach to assist teachers and students in raising achievement levels in science.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaboration sessions
 Vertical planning
 Data Days
 Implementation of BEST Standards
 Utilization of Science curriculum
 Small group instruction
 Incorporate specific science concepts in STEM class for grades 3-5

Person Responsible Michelle Loreth (lorethm@citruschools.org)

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.

According to the 19-20 data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site, Lecanto Primary reported 1.5 incidents per 100 students while the state average was 1.0 per 100.

We have initiated a behavior committee and created a plan that includes a focus of social-emotional learning. Professional development, use of a reset room, brain breaks, focus tools, counseling, and PMPs to support students are part of the plan. Discipline data and survey input (Staff, Parent, and Student).

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.

We are a PBIS school which helps us establish a positive school culture and behavior. We utilize Sanford Harmony curriculum to support building positive social and emotional skills, and build character. We review parent, staff, and student survey data to gain perspective from all stakeholders. We work together with our School Advisory Counsel in creating and facilitating school improvement goals.

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

All stakeholders have a role in promoting a positive culture. Administration appear on the Morning Show several times a week to set the expectations, communicate/celebrate/recognize students and staff who are contributing to the positive culture. We have panther tags that students earn, positive referrals, Dojo certification, and a buddy bench to help maintain the positive school wide expectations. Classroom teachers also have a variety of positive incentives/recognition in place as well. Our PTO and SAC are also supportive in creating ways to celebrate the positive.