Cypress Ridge Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Frana

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)	41%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%)
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 Lake 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

Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

https://cre.lake.k12.fl.us/

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	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

It is the mission of Cypress Ridge to ensure all of our students acquire the knowledge and learn the essential skills to achieve high levels of success through STEM learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a collaborative team of professionals who are committed to improving their practices in order to create a safe, positive, and innovative learning environment where all students excel inside and outside of the classroom.

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
Frana, Joe	Principal	Maintain the focus on the PLC process using the four questions as a guide to our planning, instruction, assessment and intervention.
Schoenthaler, Virginia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provide Science curriculum updates, DSC Lab coordinator, MTSS team member, Guiding Coalition member
Caldwell, Christina	Teacher, K-12	MTSS coordinator, Guiding Coalition member, interventionist, PASS teacher
Forsyth, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Joseph Frana

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.*
0

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

599

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

6

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

6

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	90	106	93	102	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 8/23/2022

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	90	106	93	102	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	90	106	93	102	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	7	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	80%	50%	56%				88%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						75%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						76%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	80%	46%	50%				82%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						65%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						39%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	52%	59%				79%	54%	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	84%	60%	24%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	92%	60%	32%	58%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	90%	59%	31%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

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	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	61%	21%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
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	51	56	30	54	50		50				
BLK	78	62		78	54						
HSP	78	56	40	86	70		71				
MUL	83	79		61	57						
WHT	80	59	65	79	58	46	83				
FRL	71	54	36	78	76		43				

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	54	25		49	25	8	38				
BLK	72			72							
HSP	84	71		75	43		79				
MUL	78			78							
WHT	86	54	50	81	54	27	76				
FRL	73	50		68	50		62				

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	60	71	63	47	50	32	30				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	83	79		78	57						
HSP	79	82		72	55						
MUL	92	70		77	50						
WHT	91	72	75	85	67	30	85				
FRL	81	71	87	76	56	50	75				

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	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
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	70
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	67
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	60
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?

SWD scored lower than all other subgroups in ELA(51%), Math(50%) and Science(50%)
HSP dropped in ELA(81%-78%) and Science(79%-71%)

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

The greatest need for improvement based on FSA scores comparing 2021 and 2022 is in all subject areas is with our SWD population and HSP in ELA and Science

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

Contributing factors include turn over in ESE staff, gaps in practice, scheduling
Continuing District Professional Development in best practices and resources for Support Facilitators
Implementation of Collaborative Teaching Approaches with partner teachers allowing for additional instructional strategies, more engagement in learning, etc.
Support Facilitators will join specific grade levels to collaboratively plan and conduct data discussions

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

Black students increased their proficiency in ELA and Math from 72% 2021 to 78% 2022

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

MTSS was a major focus. Intervention time was built into our schedule, data was analyzed and students walked to intervention. We began moving from Step 5 to Step 6 of the PLC process where instruction is adapted and professional development is provided for intervention development.

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

Identifying Essential Standards and monitoring the mastery of those standards and providing opportunities for reteaching and reassessing. After reassessing provide intervention when necessary. Continue being a PLC school focusing on the 4 questions.

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 at the school level includes break out sessions with the Literacy Coach and Math Coach as well as coaches being available during grade level planning and Professional Learning Time on a weekly basis. Attend and provide Professional Development when necessary.

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

Using a shared ILS position to add a New Teacher Coach and dedicated Media Center personnel. The new teacher coach will be available for new teachers and provide support with the new ELA curriculum. Media Center personnel will provide students more access to books, provide mini lessons on conferring,

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Building School Community throughout the campus	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	15 staff members attended the PLC conference in June of 2022. The overall consensus was that building community was a need on our campus.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Implementing a House System to build community throughout the school. Students in all grade levels will be in Houses and now there is a collective commitment that we are all responsible for all of our students. House Gatherings will consist of character building, buddy reading and STEM activities
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	House Gatherings will be twice per month. Guiding Coalition will determine the activities for House Gatherings and revisit/debrief at weekly Guiding Coalition meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	House systems have been proven to build community in schools around the world. The model used at the Ron Clark Academy will be part of our implementation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Members of the staff that attended the PLC conference determined a big ara of focus for our school was building community. Our Guiding Coalition presented the plan to the staff who overwhelmingly supported this model moving forward.

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.	

House Gatherings twice per month
Guiding Coalition determines House Gathering activities
Guiding Coalition monitors and adjusts House Gatherings based on debriefing discussions

Person Responsible	Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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.**	Although Learning Gains increased in Math there is still need for improvement in ELA. Learning Gains did not increase to the desired goal. Differentiation is still an area of focus.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	i-Ready diagnostic scores should increase after the winter assessment in both ELA and Math as well as Learning Gains on to be determined state assessments. *As a school we are utilizing our PLC Wednesday grade level time to concentrate on improving Tier 1 instruction. We will continue conducting 3 week MTSS grade level meetings to ensure we are providing specific research based interventions to our students. Lastly, we will monitor i-Ready winter and spring diagnostic scores as well as FAST progress monitoring to insure we will see an increase in learning gains from 55% in ELA to 65% and 54% to 64% in Math in our lowest quartile.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	*Monitoring will be through i-Ready diagnostic tests administered three times per year, MTSS collected data, and FAST progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Intervention/Enrichment block 4 times per week built into the schedule Students will walk to intervention to meet the needs of each student intervention teachers will be determined by previous assessment data results * Intervention/Enrichment blocks are built into the daily schedule 4 times per week to allow students to work on specific skills they have not yet mastered. Intervention teachers will be determined by previous standard based grade level formative assessments created. I-Ready diagnostic data, Fast progress monitoring, and formative assessments will be use to monitor our goal of increasing learning gains from 55% in ELA to 65% AND 54% to 64% in Math in our lowest quartile. .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Implementing, monitoring and supporting our teachers through MTSS meetings, site based professional development and regular classroom walks we will see learning gains across content areas.

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.

MTSS grade level meetings every three weeks
TA's supporting teachers
Moving from Step 5 to Step 6 in the PLC process where teacher data is analyzed and students not mastering the content/standard are retaught by the teacher showing the most success teaching that particular content/standard based on progress monitoring data.
Provide tutoring before and after school
Attend Professional Development when necessary

Person Responsible	Christina Caldwell (caldwellc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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.

With a Guiding Coalition we agree on meeting norms, topics to be discussed and we created our collective commitments. The Guiding Coalition shares these items with their Teams.
Collective Commitments
We are committed to recognizing when all students succeed.
During collaboration with our colleagues, we are committed to seek, share, and reflect on best practices.
As a team, we are committed to using evidence of student learning to create and monitor goals.
We are dedicated to fostering a family atmosphere where high expectations and community are a tradition.
House System(Ron Clark Academy House System) school wide to build community amongst staff and students. Older students will work with younger students in character building activities, STEM activities and Reading Buddies. House Gatherings are bimonthly and will focus on the 7 Habits of Healthy Kids

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

Joe Frana-Principal-facilitates Guiding Coalition Meetings
Joy Purvee-Assistant Principal
Christina Caldwell-Pass Teacher MTSS Coordinator
Virginia Schoenthaler-CRT
Tiffany Forsyth-Literacy Coach
Margaret Middendorf-Math Coach
Kim Navario-Kindergarten Lead
Krystal Kilgus-1st grade Lead
Brigette Stancil-2nd grade Lead
Kim Hackett-3rd grade Lead
Star Olson-4th grade Lead
Amber Lentz-5th grade Lead