Inverness Primary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Inverness Primary School

206 S LINE AVE, Inverness, FL 34452

https://ips.citrusschools.org/

Demographics

Principal: Bridget Merchant

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

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 (48%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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

Inverness Primary School

206 S LINE AVE, Inverness, FL 34452

https://ips.citrusschools.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	20%

School Grades History

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

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 Inverness Primary School mission is to provide opportunities for parents/families to become more involved in the planning, review, and improvement of school programs and the education of their children. We will strive to develop partnership with families for sharing the responsibilities for improved student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Inverness Primary School mission is to provide opportunities for parents/families to become more involved in the planning, review, and improvement of school programs and the education of their children. We will strive to develop partnerships with families for sharing the responsibilities for improved student achievement.

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
Merchant, Bridget	Principal	To provide the leadership and vision necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment conducive to learning and student success.
Varnadore, Melissia	Assistant Principal	To deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Supports the Principal in leading the school community to high levels of academic success.
Cochran, Alexis	Instructional Coach	Serves as part of the Leadership Team and be responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/15/2021, Bridget Merchant

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

687

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

2

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	107	114	104	117	96	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	12	27	29	28	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	14	14	26	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	7	6	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	98	92	96	99	91	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	9	18	13	20	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	4	9	13	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	25	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	5	10	13	28	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	12	6	10	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	98	92	96	99	91	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	9	18	13	20	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	4	9	13	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	25	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	5	10	13	28	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	12	6	10	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	47%	53%	56%				60%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						59%	48%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	52%	50%				62%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						64%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						67%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	53%	59%				62%	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	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	53%	8%
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	32	47		38	47						
BLK	5	50		30	33						
HSP	82			73							
MUL	45			27							
WHT	49	52	59	54	52	39	35				
FRL	42	52	62	47	44	35	27				
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	42	54		50	23		23				
BLK	29			48							
HSP	79			79							
MUL	42			27							
WHT	58	44	27	57	47	29	42				
FRL	50	36	33	50	38	29	31				
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	40	59	53	53	74	79					
BLK	53			53							
HSP	41	53		50	40						
WHT	62	59	62	63	65	65	58				
FRL	54	59	59	58	62	65	57				

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	48
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	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	78
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	36
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	49
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	44
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?

There is a significant increase in the ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile. In 2021, only 30% of the bottom quartile in ELA made learning gains. For 2022, 65% of the bottom quartile made learning gains in ELA. Overall learning gains also had a significant increase from 41% to 55%.

Overall proficiency decreased from 56% (2021) to 47% in ELA, from 56% (2021) to 52% in math, and from 40% (2021) to 31% in science.

iReady Data: 59% of Kindergarten students met typical growth and 35% met their stretch growth. 51% of 1st grade students met typical growth and 31% met stretch growth. 54% of 2nd grade students met typical growth and 32% met their stretch growth.

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

3rd grade ELA proficiency (below district and state averages)
4th grade ELA proficiency (below district and state averages)
5th grade ELA proficiency (below district and state averages)
3rd grade Math proficiency (below state average)
4th grade Math proficiency (below district and state averages)
5th grade Math proficiency (below district and state averages)
5th grade Science proficiency (below district and state averages)

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement:
-Lack of consistent small group instruction
-Lack of vocabulary skills/experiences
-Gaps in Foundational Reading Skills
-Tier I instruction using non-evidence based materials that lack rigor

New actions to address need for improvement:
-Collaborative planning with focus on small group instruction
-Morning message boards to increase vocabulary
-PD on Foundational Reading Skills
-A focus on improving tier I instruction through evidence based curriculum
-Increase walkthroughs with targeted feedback
-Instructional coaching with school based reading coach
-Partnership with iReady Consultants

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement with an increase of 35% (30% in 2021 and 65% in 2022).

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

Intervention fidelity was a contriburing factor to the improvement of the ELA learning gains. The additional resource of Lexia Core5 as an additional support for interventions was impactful as well.

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

Strategies we will use:
-Implementation of the Comprehension Connections in all classrooms
-Utilization of a morning message
-Data days
-Increase of small group instruction
-Study Island Science
-PBIS Rewards
-Increase use of iReady Toolbox

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.

Strategies we will use:
-Book study Comprehension Connections Bridges to Strategic Reading with Share sessions
-Book study Morning Meeting
-iReady trainings
-Weekly collaborative planning with grade level teams
-Collaboration with iReady Consultants
-Collaboration with State Literacy Director
-PBIS Rewards Professional Development

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

We will continue to support teachers with the implementation of comprehension connections and the morning message. We will provide teachers with weekly collaborative planning time as well as daily common planning. We also provide summer planning days in which teams plan for instruction.

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.**	According to our 2022 FSA data, our ELA student achievement decreased from 56% to 47%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 2022-2023, IPS will increase our ELA achievement by a minimum of 10% on state wide assessment. School wide proficiency will increase from an average of 47% to at least 57% proficient.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will progress monitor using iReady online instruction. This data will be analyzed during team meetings and help guide instruction. We will also use iReady and Lexia Core5 to intervene with identified students. Our Reading Coach will model best ELA strategies to better meet the needs of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA block with includes designated times for whole group instruction using the B.E.S.T. Standards, McGraw Hill curriculum and differentiated small group instruction. Students will complete a minimum of 40 minutes of iReady Reading sessions each week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	In order to prepare our students for a standards based assessment, we need to ensure we are providing standards based instruction to the depth of rigor necessary.

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.

Following the administration of the iReady diagnostic assessments, meet with grade level teams to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Maintain a growth model to provide needs based daily intervention for all students. Students who are at risk and are identified as T2, T3, or ESE will receive face to face instruction as well as utilize the Lexia Core5 program during the intervention block. Monitor data sheets and the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible	Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

Increase explicit teaching of comprehension strategies through professional development and monthly share sessions.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

The school and district leadership team members will monitor daily ELA instruction through the use of formal and informal walk throughs and observation data.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.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.**	According to our 2022 FSA data, our Math student achievement decreased from 56% to 52%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 2022-2023, IPS will increase our Math achievement by a minimum of 10% on state wide assessment. School wide proficiency will increase from an average of 52% to at least 62% proficient.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will progress monitor using iReady diagnostic data throughout the school year. This data will be analyzed during team meetings and help guide instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	B.E.S.T. Standards based instruction through SAVVAS in a structured math block with whole group as well as small group instruction. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 40 minutes of math iReady sessions each week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The use of structured whole group and small group instruction, research based instructional materials and manipulatives will help to increase student achievement.

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.

Professional Development Sessions- iReady overview, iReady consultants to model math lessons and share iReady toolbox resources.

Person Responsible	Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

The school and district leadership team members will monitor daily math instruction through the use of formal and informal walk throughs and observation data. Additionally, teachers and the leadership team will monitor student performance through analysis of iReady, ESGI and Citrus Assessment Data.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our number of discipline referrals has continued to rise when comparing the 21-22 school year to previous years.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 22-23 school year we will reduce the amount of discipline referrals by 5%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Referral data will be reviewed monthly with our discipline committee.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissia Varnadore (varnadorem@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	PBIS Rewards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Staff can immediately acknowledge positive behavior of students through the PBS Rewards digital platform. Students will have incentives to work towards by being recognized for good behavior.

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.	
Quarterly whole school PBIS Events to celebrate students who have less than 2 referrals in a quarter.	
Person Responsible	Melissia Varnadore (varnadorem@citrusschools.org)
Monthly Discipline/PBIS Committee Meetings will be held to analyze data, improve student behavior and address school-wide concerns.	
Person Responsible	Melissia Varnadore (varnadorem@citrusschools.org)
Recognize students with positive referrals with a shout out on the morning show and a positive call home.	
Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Professional Development in PBIS Rewards program in order to incentivize students with positive behavior.	
Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

#4. 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.	Provide high quality grade level instruction as well as intensive specifically designed instruction to increase the performance of the Black/African-American subcategory in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	During the 22-23 school year, we will increase achievement level of the subgroup of Black/African-American students from 30% to 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through disaggregating the data for the targeted subgroup using iReady and FAST assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA Block using evidence-based McGraw-Hill Wonders for whole group and small group instruction. Students will also utilize Lexia Core 5 and Curriculum Associates iReady daily with differentiated instruction in order to close performance gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	iReady and Lexia Core 5 are evidenced based programs that are targeted to meet student individual needs. Both programs have features to support remedial 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.

Following the administration of the iReady diagnostic assessments, meet with grade level teams to monitor the student progress in this subgroup.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Maintain a growth model to meet student needs through daily interventions for students in this subgroup. The at risk students will be identified and receive face to face instruction as well as utilize the Lexia Core5 program during the intervention block. Monitor data sheets and the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible	Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

#5. 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.**	Provide high quality grade level instruction as well as intensive specifically designed instruction to increase the performance of the Multi-Racial subcategory in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 22-23 school year, we will increase achievement level of the subgroup of Multi-racial students from 30% to 41%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored through disaggregating the data for the targeted subgroup using iReady and FAST assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA Block using evidence-based McGraw-Hill Wonders for whole group and small group instruction. Students will also utilize Lexia Core 5 and Curriculum Associates iReady daily with differentiated instruction in order to close performance gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	iReady and Lexia Core 5 are evidenced based programs that are targeted to meet student individual needs. Both programs have features to support remedial 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.

Following the administration of the iReady diagnostic assessments, meet with grade level teams to monitor the student progress in this subgroup.

Person Responsible	Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Maintain a growth model to meet student needs through daily interventions for students in this subgroup. The at risk students will be identified and receive face to face instruction as well as utilize the Lexia Core5 program during the intervention block. Monitor data sheets and the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible	Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.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

According to iReady end of year diagnostic, 20% of Kindergarteners did not score proficient on grade level standards, 42% of 1st graders did not score proficient on grade level standards, and 50% of 2nd graders did not score proficient on grade level standards.

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

According to our 2022 FSA data, the percentage of students who scored below a Level 3 in grade 3 was 59%, grade 4 had 51% who scored below a Level 3, and grade 5 had 51% who scored below a Level 3.

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)

During the 2022-2023 school year, IPS will increase our ELA achievement in grades K-2 to at least 50% of our students scoring proficient on grade level standards using the FAST progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

During the 2022-2023 school year, IPS will increase our ELA achievement for grades 3-5 school wide proficiency from an average of 47% to at least 57% proficient using FAST progress monitoring.

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.

We will progress monitor using iReady online instruction. This data will be analyzed during team meetings to help guide instruction. We will also use iReady and Lexia Core5 to intervene with identified students. Our Reading Coach will also model best ELA strategies as well as consult with our State Literacy Director and Curriculum Associates Consultant.

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

Varnadore, Melissia, varnadorem@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. §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?

K-5 programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes:
-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?

The three programs are evidenced based and differentiate in order to meet students need.

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
IPS will form a literacy leadership committee where instructional leaders are instrumental in supporting Literacy activities.	Varnadore, Melissia, varnadorem@citrusschools.org
Our IPS Reading Coach will conduct Literacy Coaching where she models best instructional practices and evidence based programs.	Cochran, Alexis, cochrana@citrusschools.org
The assessment used to progress monitor our students progress is the FAST.	Varnadore, Melissia, varnadorem@citrusschools.org
Our IPS Reading Coach will facilitate Professional Learning to support instruction. Weekly Collaborative planning will occur with teams as well as iReady consultation sessions. Through the weekly collaborative planning sessions, both general and special education teachers will have the opportunity to plan and implement best strategies for all learners including implementing Universal Design for Learning. Comprehension Connections will be explicitly taught to teachers and then we will hold Share Sessions where teachers can share what they have implemented in their classrooms.	Cochran, Alexis, cochrana@citrusschools.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.

IPS address building a positive school culture and environment by promoting positive behavior. Staff can recognize students through positive referrals. Administration reads the positive referral on the morning show and calls the parent/guardian of the student to share the awesome news. IPS holds quarterly PBIS events where students without referrals are recognized and given a chance to celebrate their positive choices. We

are also adding the additional component of the digital PBIS Rewards system where students can earn digital tokens to earn incentives.

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

IPS staff: Recognize students who have displayed positive behavior through positive referrals. Teachers also choose 1 student each month to be recognized as a "Terrific Kid" based on a monthly character trait.

Parent Teacher Organization: Hosts family events to help promote student/parent/school involvement.

Community Members and Local Businesses: Help financially support events and other school needs.

Safety Patrol Members: Selected 5th grade students serve as a Safety Patrol and they help maintain safe hallways and serve as role models for other students.