

Citrus County Schools

Citrus Springs 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 Springs Elementary School

3570 W CENTURY BLVD, Citrus Springs, FL 34433

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

Demographics

Principal: Sharen Lowe

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (49%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Citrus County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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

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 Springs Elementary School

3570 W CENTURY BLVD, Citrus Springs, FL 34433

<https://cse.citruschools.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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 Citrus County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

Citrus Springs Elementary School is committed to fostering a safe learning environment where all scholars are valued, respected, and surrounded by authentic opportunities to take ownership of their learning. We stand steadfast in our promise to cultivate tomorrow's leaders by preparing every scholar for a future of achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At CSE, we Empower Excellence in Every Scholar, Every Day

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
Lowe, Sharen	Principal	Planning and leading all students and staff with regard to curriculum, pedagogy, school safety, student discipline, and evaluating all systems of the school.
Vonderhaar, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Planning and leading all students and staff with regard school safety, student discipline, facilities, instruction, and staff evaluation.
Grassman, Jennifer	School Counselor	Provide school counseling services to students in need, serve as the coordinator of 504s, make referrals to outside agencies, provide resources to families in need.
Ear, Kimberly	Reading Coach	Observe, model and coach in classrooms for core reading instruction, facilitate PLCs focused on ELA instruction, organize and facilitate the Literacy Leadership Team
Franz, Alexandria	Staffing Specialist	Monitor IEP compliance, conduct IEP meetings, schedule professional learning relevant to ESE services, support new ESE teachers, participate in PST meetings

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Sharen Lowe

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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

10

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

9

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	111	114	142	159	120	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	23	35	36	44	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	13	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	2	6	17	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	0	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	23	33	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	2	14	19	40	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	3	2	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	128	117	101	114	124	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	12	20	19	19	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	4	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	4	13	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	35	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	29	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	2	11	18	23	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	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	128	117	101	114	124	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	12	20	19	19	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	4	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	4	13	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	35	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	29	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	2	11	18	23	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	53%	56%				58%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						51%	48%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	52%	50%				59%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%						61%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						44%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	53%	59%				73%	60%	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	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	71%	58%	13%	53%	18%
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	17	42	46	13	30	24	13				
HSP	45	55		36	45		60				
MUL	33			47							
WHT	51	56	53	54	54	31	54				
FRL	46	53	44	49	53	31	52				
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	21	35	50	11	17	25	29				
BLK	33			47							
HSP	41	43		49	38		30				
MUL	73			55							
WHT	47	43	40	52	43	24	46				
FRL	45	43	42	47	37	17	42				
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	26	29	23	26	32	35	25				
ELL	40			60							
BLK	56	40		33							
HSP	48	39		50	57	40	91				
MUL	53	36		53	64						
WHT	61	65	55	62	63	50	73				
FRL	51	54	46	55	57	40	73				

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
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	47
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?

- Decrease in 5th grade Math scores
- Math significant improvement in the lowest quartile.
- Overall ESSA Federal Index increased from 40% to 49%
- Subgroups of focus is students with disabilities and multiracial
- 13% of our students with disabilities in 3,4,5 scored above a 3 ELA
- 14% of our students with disabilities in 3,4,5 scored above a 3 Math
- ELA we are below state
- Learning Gains: CSE at 55% in ELA; Bottom Quartile at 48%, Math at 54%, Bottom Quartile at 32%.
- iReady Quadrant data- showed growth in reading, but not in high performance, high growth. Lots of growth with lower students
- iReady Quadrant data- showed growth in math, but not in high performance, high growth. Lots of growth with lower students

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

- Overall ELA proficiency
- Overall Math proficiency

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

- Unfilled teaching positions
- Lack of small group, differentiated instruction

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

- Increased math performance in lowest quartile
- Increased learning gains in ELA and Math

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

Implementation of PLCs

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

- Small group, differentiated instruction, after school tutoring, collaborative planning

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.

- Weekly PLC/Facilitated Planning

- Partnership with iReady for professional development in small group, differentiated instruction

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

- Continued PLCs

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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. 48% of students in grades 3 through 5 scored proficient on FSA ELA

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. 60% of our students in grades 3-5 score a level 3 or higher on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in ELA

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Ear (eark@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Small group, differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. In collaboration with the Florida Regional Literacy Directors and Curriculum Associates, the area of deficiency appears to come from a lack of explicit, small group instruction.

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 PLC/Facilitated Planning with the support of the Literacy Coach
- Instructional planning and modeling by the Literacy Coach

Person Responsible

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

51% of students in grades 3 through 5 scored proficient in FSA Math

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

65% of students in 3-5 score a level 3 or higher on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in Mathematics (FAST).

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

FAST Progress Monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

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

Small group, differentiated instruction

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

In collaboration with Curriculum Associates, it appears that the lack of small group instruction hindered performance.

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 Math PLC/Facilitated Planning
- Professional Development in BEST Math Standards

Person Responsible

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

#3. 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.

SWD FSA ELA Performance: 13% proficient
 SWD FSA Math Performance: 14% proficient

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

30% of our SWD in grade 3-5 score a level 3 or higher on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in ELA and Math

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

FAST Progress Monitoring and iReady ELA/Math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandria Franz (franza@citruschools.org)

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

Sonday System for Reading
 Small group, differentiated instruction
 Inclusion Teaching Model

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

With a fully staffed ESE department, we will provide students with disabilities the specially designed instruction needed to support growth.

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 Facilitated Planning
- Progress monitor subgroup data
- Professional Development in Standards

Person Responsible

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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

40% Federal Index Rating

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

55% of all students identified as multi-racial will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math as measured by FAST assessment.

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

FAST Progress Monitoring
 iReady

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Vonderhaar
 (vonderhaarj@citrusschools.org)

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

Small group, differentiated instruction

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

Small group instruction was not pervasive in grades 3-5.

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 PLC/Facilitated Planning
- Professional Development in small group instruction

Person Responsible

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citrusschools.org)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

- 906 referrals for the school year
- 12 students (tier 3) accounted for 396 referrals
- 6 students (tier 2) accounted for 90 referrals
- 136 students (tier 1) accounted for 420 referrals

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease behavior referrals by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Behavior data will be reviewed monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Vonderhaar
(vonderhaarj@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The need for a school-wide system is evident.

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.

PBIS Reward System: New Schoolwide Discipline System
Explicit professional development in positive behavior interventions

Person Responsible

Jennifer Vonderhaar
(vonderhaarj@citruschools.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

9.3% of K-3 students are not on track to score at or above grade level on the statewide assessment of ELA. Through a partnership with Curriculum Associates, we will provide professional development for small group, differentiated instruction in ELA. We will also collaborate with Dee Toler, Regional Literacy Director, to guide our study and implementation of the teaching strategies from the Science of Reading. We are conducting ELA walkthroughs with Dee Toler to inspect the reading strategies introduced during training.

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

(Grade 3) 65% of all 3rd grade students scored below Level 3 as measured by FSA ELA in 2021-2022. Through a partnership with Curriculum Associates, we will provide professional learning opportunities for teachers to improve small group instruction in the ELA block. The literacy framework will be uniformly designed and implemented in all ELA classrooms to include scheduled small group rotations. We will collaborate with the Regional Literacy Director, Dee Toler, to deepen the understanding of our 3rd - 5th grade teachers relative to the the identification of reading deficiencies and the how to use small group instruction to meet these needs. We are conducting ELA walkthroughs with Dee Toler to inspect the reading strategies introduced during training.

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)

60% of all K-2 students will score proficient as measured by FAST ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

60% of all 3-5 K-2 students will score proficient as measured by FAST ELA.

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.

Data will be reviewed weekly in PLCs, monthly by the leadership team, and quarterly as a whole staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lowe, Sharen, lowes@citrusschools.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. 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?

McGraw-Hill-Wonders: Promising Evidence (Source-Evidence for ESSA)

Curriculum Associates-iReady: Promising Evidence (Source-Evidence for ESSA)

Lexia Core5: Promising Evidence (Source-Evidence for ESSA)

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?

Small group differentiated instruction is shown to have a high effect size in reading research.

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
Implementation of a Literacy Leadership Team Coaching and Modeling with the Literacy Coach	Lowe, Sharen, lowes@citruschools.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.

We plan to increase the number of parent involvement events, maximize parent/guardian presence and involvement at school wide events and grade level sponsored activities with a goal of 70% of families to be in attendance.

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

PTO will financially support family events and support promotion of events.
 The Literacy Leadership Committee will plan literacy family events.