
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

Forest Ridge Elementary School

2927 N FOREST RIDGE BLVD, Hernando, FL 34442

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

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Mchugh

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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

Forest Ridge Elementary School

2927 N FOREST RIDGE BLVD, Hernando, FL 34442

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>36%</p>

School Grades History

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

The mission of Forest Ridge Elementary is to create a community of life-long learners who will engage in meaningful activities to enhance academic growth, celebrate diversity, and experience success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will maintain each child's right to learn through appropriate learning experiences, sound discipline policies and self-respect for others. We pledge to communicate to parents and involve them in this process.

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
Bone, Heather	Instructional Coach	Assisting teachers in all academic areas, coaching/modeling instructional methods and strategies, analyzing student achievement for the purpose of raising student achievement.
Ear, Sean	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in leading the school community to high levels of academic success
McHugh, Michelle	Principal	Lead staff, students and families to high levels of academic achievement
Rossi, Shannon	Staffing Specialist	ESE specialist, assists in the identification and support of students with specially designed instruction

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Michelle Mchugh

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

711

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

1

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

5

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	97	113	100	124	118	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	13	30	24	26	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	5	17	13	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	4	12	9	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	22	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	28	27	33	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	18	20	24	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	7	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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	107	98	110	114	95	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	25	20	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	11	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	17	28	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	3	10	12	15	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	7	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	107	98	110	114	95	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	25	20	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	11	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	17	28	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	3	10	12	15	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	7	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	60%	53%	56%				67%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						61%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						54%	48%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	52%	50%				70%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						69%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						52%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	53%	59%				53%	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	72%	61%	11%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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	69%	58%	11%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	59%	20%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	53%	-1%
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	23	41	35	24	46	33	37				
ELL											
BLK	27			40							
HSP	63	68		67	60		67				
MUL	58	42		63	61		40				
WHT	62	59	38	59	54	40	58				
FRL	55	58	47	55	49	46	46				
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	8		18	15		8				
ELL	33			33							
ASN	100			91							
BLK											
HSP	54	43		46	43		41				
MUL	56			50							
WHT	62	43	35	59	45	36	54				
FRL	50	39	30	47	38	30	43				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	36	37	34	55	45	25				
ELL	36			50							
ASN	92	73		92	82						
BLK	53	36		41	64						
HSP	59	63		65	65		50				
MUL	80	79		70	71						
WHT	67	59	50	72	68	45	54				
FRL	63	57	50	67	66	50	51				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404

ESSA Federal Index	
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	34
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	65
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	53
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	48
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?

Overall our students in grades 3-5 showed an increase in learning gains from 2021 to 2022 in ELA and Math. When looking at our 3rd graders in ELA they went from a 68% scoring a level 3 or higher to a 57% in 2022. Math in 3rd grade showed a decline in students scoring 3 or above. Our 4th grades showed a 20% gain from 2021 to 2022 of students scoring a level 3 or higher. In iReady 1st, 4th and 5th showed typical growth in math and 1st grade showed low performance and low growth.

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

Our 3-5 grade overall math scores showed limited growth from 54% to 60% as well as our ELA from 59% to 60% and shows the greatest need for improvement.

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

Some of the contributing factors were staffing hardships for the 2021-2022 school year, COVID and MAFS. Some new actions that would need to be taken to address the need for improvement would be to implement a longer Impact time to provide extra support for all students. Implementation of the new BEST math standards, new math adoption and the integration of professional learning communities within our school.

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

iReady school wide in math we went from 13%-60% and ELA 13% to 39%. FSA math we showed the most improvement from 54%- 60%.

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

Contributing factors include iReady data chats and progress monitoring of the usage.

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

iReady PLC's monthly to monitor and implement best strategies while implementing the BEST standards in ELA and Math.

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.

Monthly PLC's, Comprehension Strategies, Modeling, Classroom Walkthrough's with our new walk through form, Savvas Training, PD on what to do with data, iReady training, Wonders Training, BEST standards training in reading and math

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

Varsity tutoring for our 2nd grade. Monthly PLC's, Comprehension Strategies, Modeling, Classroom Walkthrough's with our new walk through form, Savvas Training, PD on what to do with data, iReady training, Wonders Training, BEST standards training in reading and math

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 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.

Increase learning gains for SWD students The 2022 data indicated that we were 34% which is below the federal index of 41%.

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

The students with disabilities subgroup will increase to 42% based on the Federal Index percentage.

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

Data review of SWD data (iready, Lexia, citrus assessment, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Rossi (rossis@citruschools.org)

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

Providing Professional development on high yield strategies for providing quality specially designed instruction in conjunction with coaching cycles

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

To support the teachers in the delivery of instruction to expand the students' capacity for learning based on high yield strategies (Marzano/Thompson)

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.

- Once monthly grade-level team focus on high yield strategies for SWDs
- PD high yield strategies for SWD to enhance specially designed instruction
- learning targets reflected in lesson plans
- Monthly admin team collaboration to review SWD data
- Grade level team data chats

Person Responsible

Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citruschools.org)

#2. 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.

Our 3-5 students overall ELA scores showed a minimal increase of 1% from the 2021 to the 2022 school year.

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

Students performing at proficient or above will demonstrate growth on state standardized testing will show an increase of 20%.

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

ELA walkthrough
 RTI walkthroughs
 RTI attendance sheets
 Collaborative and independent data review and analysis

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citruschools.org)

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

ELA walkthrough
 RTI walkthroughs
 RTI attendance sheets
 PLC'S
 Collaborative and independent data review and analysis
 Comprehension Connections-mini PD sessions

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

To support the teachers in the delivery of instruction to expand the students' capacity for learning based on increasing comprehension

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.

- PD-writing with wonders
- Supportive Coaching
- Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness, phonics, etc)
- Artifact share outs
- Teacher walkthrough to view best practices

Person Responsible

Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citruschools.org)

#3. 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. Our 3-5 students overall Math scores showed an increase of 6% from the 2021 to the 2022 school year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Students performing at proficient or above will demonstrate growth on state standardized testing by 20%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. MTR look fors walkthroughs
 Data review days
 Teachers will adjust their instruction based on the students' needs indicated by data
 Collaborative and independent data review and analysis

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Bone (boneh@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Providing professional development on the Big M, Florida Best Math Standards, Best Savvas

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. To support the teachers in the delivery of instruction to expand the students' capacity for learning math.

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.

- PD-Florida Best Standards, Savvas
- Supportive Coaching
- Look for Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness,

Person Responsible Michelle McHugh
 (mchughm@citruschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Increase student performance in science in 2021 students in grades 3-5 scoring a level 3 or higher was a 49% in 2022 we increased to a 56%.

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

Scoring 3 or above will be 60% or higher

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

Common assessments in study island (3,4,5)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Bone (boneh@citruschools.org)

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

Weekly data review, Citrus assessment data assessment, Science Common assessments

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

To support the teachers in the delivery of instruction to expand the students' capacity for increasing understanding in science

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.

- PD -study island
- Supportive Coaching
- use of science curriculum
- Data analysis
- Common assessments

Person Responsible

Sean Ear (ears@citruschools.org)

#5. 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.

Increase learning gains for black/African American students. The 2022 data indicated that we were below the 41% on the federal percent of points index with a score of 34%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Forest Ridge will increase to earn 43% pf the points on the federal percent of points index.

Monitoring:

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

Data review of black/African American subgroup. Teachers will adjust instruction based on the student needs as indicated by the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Bone (boneh@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ELA walkthrough
 RTI walkthroughs
 RTI attendance sheets
 PLC'S
 Collaborative and independent data review and analysis
 Comprehension Connections-mini PD sessions

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

To support the teachers in the delivery of instruction to expand the students' capacity for learning based on increasing comprehension

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.

- PD-writing with wonders
- Supportive Coaching
- Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness, phonics, etc)
- Artifact share outs
- Teacher walkthrough to view best practices

Person Responsible

Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citruschools.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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

Increase learning gains for English Language Learner students. The 2022 data indicated that we were below the 41% on the federal percent of points index with a score of 27%.

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

Forest Ridge will increase to earn 43% pf the points on the federal percent of points index.

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

Data review of English Language Learners subgroup.
 Teachers will adjust instruction based on the student needs as indicated by the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

ELA walkthrough
 RTI walkthroughs
 RTI attendance sheets
 PLC'S
 Collaborative and independent data review and analysis
 Comprehension Connections-mini PD sessions

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

- PD-writing with wonders
- Supportive Coaching
- Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness, phonics, etc)
- Artifact share outs
- Teacher walkthrough to view best practices

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.

- PD-writing with wonders
- Supportive Coaching
- Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness, phonics, etc)
- Artifact share outs
- Teacher walkthrough to view best practices

Person Responsible Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citruschools.org)

- PD-writing with wonders
- Supportive Coaching
- Walkthroughs
- Grade level team data chats
- Monitoring data and instruction for the building blocks of comprehension (Phonemic awareness, phonics, etc)
- Artifact share outs
- Teacher walkthrough to view best practices

Person Responsible

Michelle McHugh (mchughm@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.

Forest Ridge seeks PTA group members through newsletters, phone calls, and monthly meetings. Ranking members such as president are nominated by others involved participants and then voted on. Forest Ridge Elementary uses a variety of communication methods to keep parents informed and involved in making decisions to assist our parent in becoming partners in their child's education. Parents are in a variety of ways encourage to participate in surveys, and school events such as Literacy Night, Title one Fall Event, PTA, SAC, volunteering, mentoring, family nights, Fitness Owls and parent conferences. At FRE we seek parental input on ways to improve usage of Title 1. To increase participation and support from our parent we encourage all staff members to utilize classroom newsletters, fliers, school messenger, the school website, social media, class Dojo, Remind and electronically to meetings and parent nights.

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

Stakeholder groups include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school