

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Citrus Park Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Citrus Park Elementary School

7700 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Fonteyn

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fonteyn, Chris	Principal	
Isajar, Jackie	Assistant Principal	
Morris, Ali	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Christopher Fonteyn

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

543

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	69	70	94	73	75	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	20	10	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	9	7	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	7	12	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	7	12	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	53%	56%				63%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						62%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						52%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	76%	50%	50%				68%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	77%						63%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						43%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	59%	59%				56%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	42	46	50	60	70	56	35				
ELL	56	72	69	80	84	83	53				
ASN	77	69		100	81						
BLK	45			64							
HSP	63	66	64	70	76	65	59				
MUL	81	90		94	90						
WHT	69	68	73	78	78	83	50				
FRL	61	66	57	74	78	76	51				

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	40	65		44	59	50	55				
ELL	56	46		58	54		46				
ASN	75			80							
BLK	69			63							
HSP	54	50	27	52	53	45	52				
MUL	64			71							
WHT	69	76		63	67		68				
FRL	59	53	33	59	61	50	55				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	72
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	67
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	89
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	71
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Students struggle with science compared to ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Both Science and Black Students fall below school averages.

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

Small group instruction targeting individual needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Lowest quartile in both ELA and Math showed the greatest improvement.

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

Teachers studied student data and targeted student needs in both whole group and small group instruction. I-Ready gave daily individual instruction at the students level during independent time.

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

Continuation of up-to-date data review and targeted instruction to improve student performance.

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.

The PD committee will review teacher data and discuss professional development to enhance student learning.

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

Continuous review of present student data will be reviewed and targeted instruction will be provided to enhance student learning.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Looking at the data achievement and growth differences between the ELL, ESE subgroups as well as the students who were behind due to various Covid related issues, we need to focus on the MTSS process to target specific needs to make up for the gaps in student learning.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The progress monitoring data shows that the ELL and ESE subgroups lag behind their same age peers in our formative testing data. With the structured use of the MTSS process we hope to target learning needs and close the gap between the subgroups and same age peers between Fall, Winter, and spring formative assessments to include but not exclusive of: i-Ready, Achieve 3000 level sets, Stemscope Benchmark Assessments, SIPP's Mastery Tests.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Post Formative Assessment, PLC's will review student data make adjustments to instruction and discuss findings with the ILT to see school wide trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The school will be using the 4-Step Problem Solving Process to track student progression to see if the interventions being used are working. If not, modify instruction and assess again.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In review of the data we have found that the school is very good at looking at data and seeing strengths and weaknesses, however... The follow up assessment to see if the interventions are working often is left to the formative assessments given Fall, Winter, and Spring, not on a more regular basis.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Every six weeks grade levels will meet with the school leadership team to go over students and the plans, interventions, monitoring tools, and progress of tier III students. Meetings will be calendared out throughout the year. District personnel will be contacted to assist when needed.

Person Responsible

Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The pandemic (Covid-19) has had a large impact on the culture of the school. Large gatherings did not happen as often and students felt isolated from their peers. Although this isolation has improved over the last year, students are still recovering from months of being either learning from home without their peers, or feeling isolated within their school setting by lack of group work or group school functions. Maslow's Hierarchy of Learning begins with the students' basic needs being met, including emotional needs. With 3 units of Access students, and 2 Behavior Supports units, there is a need for teaching social emotional skills and how to adapt to life situations. The Panorama survey revealed that the students in this school scored themselves below the district average and dropped over the course of the year. Last years 5th grade had multiple "social media" episodes that bled into the classroom, interfering with student learning.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

When students take the Panorama survey their percent favorable will increase over the course of the year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Utilizing class meetings and through PLC's to monitor students' well being.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcy White (marcy.white@hcps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will be using Conscious Discipline as well as CBS (through Frameworks Coaching).

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy:

Both Conscious Discipline and CBS teach students how to self regulate as well as set up the framework for teaching behavioral skills.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The principal will schedule trainings throughout the year to educate the staff on SEL Practices. This will be done through Frameworks.

9/6/22

10/11/22

11/1/22

1/17/23

2/14/23

4/4/23

Person Responsible Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

A Frameworks coach will work with teachers to ensure practices are being utilized in the best emotional support of students.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school utilizes Conscious Discipline and PBIS to set Tier 1 Cultural and behavioral goals. We have teamed up with Frameworks to train and deliver Social Emotional Learning (SEL) to better provide support to staff and students. They also provide SEL training for families twice a year.

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

The Social Emotional Learning (SEL) committee will meet on a monthly basis to discuss behavior trends and discuss Tier I interventions. Marcy White and Marcy Smith lead the committee with representatives from each grade level. The committee create, promote, and run school wide PBIS events to promote a positive culture. Students earn "I noticed" tickets to purchase rewards from the school store and to be able to attend school wide events. Every Monday morning, teachers hold a class meeting to promote a positive learning environment and work out any class issues.