Citrus Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Citrus Elementary School

2771 CITRUS PL, Vero Beach, FL 32968

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Tosha Jones

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
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: C (50%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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

Citrus Elementary School

2771 CITRUS PL, Vero Beach, FL 32968

www.indianriverschools.org

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 KG-5	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

The mission of Citrus Elementary: We are guiding today's children to BEEcome tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Citrus is a school of community citizenship. The staff inspires all students to be a part of our community where everyone "Bee-longs." Our goal is to develop learners who are service oriented. We build empathy and cooperation amongst one another, in hopes of developing future community and service leaders.

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
Jones, Tosha	Principal	
Rahal, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Koppelman, Rene	Instructional Coach	
Farmer, Dionna	Instructional Coach	
Del Tufo, Amber	Instructional Coach	
Keeler, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Tosha Jones

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.*
2

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
69

Total number of students enrolled at the school
663

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

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	105	104	106	129	111	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	7	25	19	25	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	17	40	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	0	3	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	6	2	16	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 10/20/2022

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	91	99	105	126	113	0	1200	0	0	0	0	0	0	1734
Attendance below 90 percent	27	27	31	32	35	28	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	8	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	20	18	41	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	4	4	2	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	93	104	106	128	117	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	17	17	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	8	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	9	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	4	3	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	51%	58%	56%				52%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						60%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						62%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	55%	50%				58%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						64%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						59%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	60%	59%				49%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	56%	64%	-8%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
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	20	36	31	30	45	44	20				
ELL	33	45	44	55	50	44	28				
BLK	43	43	25	56	49	36	19				
HSP	47	50	43	58	53	57	47				
MUL	35	58		47	40						
WHT	57	59	52	63	59	54	53				
FRL	53	54	42	61	53	40	37				

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	22	33	41	29	42	56	19				
ELL	43	50		58	50		50				
BLK	41	36		41	32		32				
HSP	50	53		54	44		46				
MUL	57			42							
WHT	59	44		61	41		51				
FRL	52	41	53	56	43	55	41				
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	21	44	52	27	51	54	33				
ELL	39	58	61	49	66	64	17				
BLK	36	53	59	42	63	50	28				
HSP	45	56	55	61	67	67	33				
MUL	47	70		29							
WHT	62	65	71	64	61	62	64				
FRL	47	57	59	55	66	61	47				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	45
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	58
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	51
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?

Proficiency with phonics continues to be insufficient.
Increased discipline referrals with 5th grade students.
Male African American students did not make adequate learning gains
ESE students did not make adequate learning gains.

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

DIBELS data, iReady Diagnostic data results, Florida State Assessment data

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

Structures and routines in need of improvement = Coaching, increased implementation of PBIS
New BEST Standards. New ELA curriculum Insufficient Tier 1 instruction = Collaborative planning, coaching, consistent use of curriculum, data chats focused on walk-throughs

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

Math proficiency increased by 5 points.

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

Effective collaborative planning, coaching, deep-dive into standards.

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

Improve consistency of expectations, rules, routines to improve classroom management and discipline occurrences.
Improve instruction, engagement, and monitoring in Tier 1 Core content (ELA, Math, and Science)
Continue effective collaborative planning.
Support and coaching of new faculty members.

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.

PD on school, grade-level, and classroom data to indicate upward and downward trends, and areas for improvement.
PD focused on effective implementation and use of formative assessment and monitoring of student learning.
PBIS training.

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

Fidelity monitoring, instructional walk-throughs, district impact walks, training from district support personnel, coaching cycles.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	2022 FSA data indicated that African American males did not make adequate learning gains in ELA or Math. This subgroup fell below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On 2023 FAST data African America Males will improve by 2% as indicated on the ESSA Federal Index.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	iReady data, FAST data, STAR data, district content common assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teacher and student monitoring and formative assessments: Learners monitor their own progress, learners receive and respond to teacher feedback, teacher checks for understanding throughout the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These strategies are included in Marzano's evidence -based 9 High Yield Strategies. Based on 2021-22 Impact Walk Data, these areas resulted in being our highest areas of need.

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.

Weekly collaborative planning with instructional coaches that includes conversation around planned formative assessments and monitoring for student understanding.
Data chats with grade level teams, administrators, and instructional coaches focused on areas for improvement.
School-based and district impact walks to monitor focus areas.
Extended blocks of time (half-day) for the purpose of effective collaborative planning for high quality instruction.
Professional development sessions focused on formative assessment and monitoring for understanding.

Person Responsible	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students with Disabilities scored at 34% according to the ESSA Federal Index. This should be above 42%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The goal is for our Students with Disabilities to score above the 41% threshold according to ESSA Federal Index.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	iReady data, FAST data, STAR data, district content common assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher and student monitoring and formative assessments: Learners monitor their own progress, learners receive and respond to teacher feedback, teacher checks for understanding throughout the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	These strategies are included in Marzano's evidence -based 9 High Yield Strategies. Based on 2021-22 Impact Walk Data, these areas resulted in being our highest areas of need.

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.

Weekly collaborative planning with instructional coaches that includes conversation around planned formative assessments and monitoring for student understanding.
Data chats with grade level teams, administrators, and instructional coaches focused on areas for improvement.
School-based and district impact walks to monitor focus areas.
Extended blocks of time (half-day) for the purpose of effective collaborative planning for high quality instruction.
Professional development sessions focused on formative assessment and monitoring for understanding.

Person Responsible   Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

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

Tier 1 Curriculum taught with fidelity.
Collaborative planning with instructional coach - weekly.
Interventionist focused on remediating gaps in reading proficiency, mainly in phonics.
Tier 2 and 3 interventions focused on students' greatest need.

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

Tier 1 Curriculum taught with fidelity.
Collaborative planning with instructional coach - weekly.
Interventionist focused on remediating gaps in 3rd grade reading proficiency.
Tier 2 and 3 interventions focused on student greatest need, mainly fluency and comprehension.

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)

51% of our students in grade K-2 will demonstrate proficiency according to STAR (2nd Grade) or iReady (K-1st grade).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

51% of our students in Grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA on FAST.

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.

Progress will be monitored bi weekly in RTI, weekly pathway lessons will be tracked, District Progress Monitoring assessments (3rd grade) will be analyzed using Power Bi, and 2nd- 5th grade will have data chats regarding progress on Standards Mastery Tests from I Ready, Winter FAST testing data will be triangulated with I Ready and new trend data will be analyzed and used to guide RTI groups and interventions. Our final data point will be the end of the year FAST/STAR test to measure proficiency for each grade.

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

Jones, Tosha, tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org

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. §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?

Amplify Tier 1 curriculum and Amplify Remediation Guide, iReady Scaffolded Lessons, iReady Magnetic Reading, iReady Phonics for Reading, Sonday, Lexia Core 5, Read Works, Discovery Ed SOS Strategies, Thinking Maps, close reading strategies to aid comprehension.

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?

Yes, all practices/programs are specifically aligned to identified needs.
Yes, all are research-based and district approved.

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
School-based Leadership Team meets each week. Literacy Coaches communicate relay pertinent, relevant information to grade level teams.	Rahal, Kimberly, kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org
District Literacy Specialists will meet with Literacy Coaches and support academic needs.	Carlsen, Tiffany, tiffany.carlsen@indianriverschools.org
Professional Development to support improvement in formative assessment and monitoring.	Rahal, Kimberly, kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org

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.

Data Findings: Quarter 1- 18 CIR&ODR, (7 CIR, 11 ODR) 3-4 students with repeated discipline infractions

Rationale for Selection of Data: To create a positive, emotionally safe environment within the classroom

High Yield Strategy: Environment

Goal: Reduce the number of Minor Infractions and ODR submissions each by 10% during the first quarter of 2022-2023 compared to the first quarter of 2021-2022.

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

(Principal and Assistant Principal)
- PD on Behavior Response and Intervention Matrix

"Who you call and why"

(School Counselor)
- PBIS training on new incentive program
Update PBIS posters.