

Orange County Public Schools

# Citrus Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Citrus Elementary

87 N CLARKE RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://citrus.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Mary Clark**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/17/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Citrus Elementary

87 N CLARKE RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://citrus.ocps.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>86%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B		C	C

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### 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
Walker, Robert	Principal	Mr. Robert Walker (Principal) serves as primary building level administrator. Mr. Walker provides a common vision; with a focus on standards-based instruction, data-based decision making, and providing systems of support for instructional staff to ensure the success and well-being of all students.
Jackson, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Deborah Jackson leads planning for all core content areas, provides professional development, locates resources for teams, creates grade level formative assessments, develops standards based scales with student evidence, meets weekly with PLC's during common planning meetings, and coaches teachers on effective instructional strategies
Harrison, Katie	Staffing Specialist	Katie Harrison assists the MTSS team in identifying at-risk students and developing appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions. She assists with properly matching interventions or strategies to support student achievement. In addition, she schedules and facilitates IEP and 504 meetings with the respective stakeholders.
St. Onge, Daniel	Instructional Coach	Daniel St. Onge supports teachers with planning for Math and Science, provides professional development, locates resources for teams, creates grade level formative assessments, develops standards based scales with student evidence.
Stodolak, Cindy	School Counselor	Cindy Stodolak is the school's Guidance Counselor. Her primary role is to implement and maintain a comprehensive, schoolwide counseling program, to include SEL support for teachers, and individual or small group counseling for students. Additionally, Ms. Stodolak leads the Threat Assessment Team, meeting monthly to support students in need. Ms. Stodolak is the school's McKinneyVento contact/coordinator, a member of the CST team, is the suicide ideation and Baker Act contact, and supports school-wide behavior plans, as well as individual behavior modification plans.
Payne, Tiffany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Tiffany Payne is the school's Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT). She supports teachers in implementing and monitoring assessments such as i-Ready Diagnostic, CRM common formative assessments, Florida Standards Assessment, ACCESS testing, and EOC exams. Ms. Payne is also the school's MTSS coordinator. She implements and monitors school-wide MTSS practices,



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>assesses its productivity, identifies appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions and assists teachers in identifying both academic and behaviorally at-risk students. She supports new and experienced teachers with curriculum resources and provides mentor support</p>
Glover, Ashley	Assistant Principal	<p>Dr. Glover support serves as building level administrator. Dr. Glover assists in supporting the principal with established common vision and all initiatives relative to this focus. Dr. Glover oversees school-wide procedures and facilities, and supports the instructional focus of the school. .</p>
Deas, Nyeema	Behavior Specialist	<p>Nyeema Deas helps coordinate Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plan that address students' inappropriate behaviors and provide a means to help the students become more academically successful. Mrs. Deas also supports the school's behavioral management plan.</p>
Savino, Elisa	Dean	<p>Elisa Savino maintains student behavior expectations and behavior support for all students. Ms. Savino supports teachers with their in-class behavior plans, is primary role for any student discipline initiatives such as investigations into student-on-student infractions, and Title IX. Ms. Savino also supports the schools positive behavior support plan.</p>

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 2/17/2020, Mary Clark

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

28

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

489

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

5

**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	82	69	66	90	73	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468
Attendance below 90 percent	2	24	14	13	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	1	1	4	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/29/2022

**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	11	70	72	94	76	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	2	17	14	16	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	11	70	72	94	76	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	2	17	14	16	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	55%	56%	56%				56%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	73%						61%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						45%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	46%	50%				58%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						52%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						44%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	61%	59%				50%	56%	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	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	53%	-7%
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	7	50	58	19	44		8				
ELL	46	70	71	54	66	43	40				
ASN	68	91		79	73						
BLK	50	74	73	49	60	52	43				
HSP	50	66	55	59	67	25	53				
WHT	71	67		54	56		70				
FRL	45	69	65	44	60	53	43				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8			8							
ELL	25	33		38	36		7				
ASN	69			75							
BLK	35	39	29	37	33	13	39				
HSP	24	31		27	8		38				
WHT	54	61		53	47		39				
FRL	34	48	50	35	35	31	30				

  

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	12	35	38	21	45	46					
ELL	37	53	44	36	47	47	31				
ASN	76	64		76	82						
BLK	54	60	34	55	49	41	46				
HSP	56	65	57	55	49	29	48				
WHT	59	58		61	53		52				
FRL	48	56	43	51	52	32	34				

**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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

  

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
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	53
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?**

Although Citrus Elementary experienced a 14% increase in Math Achievement over the prior year, the school's lowest 25% earned 45% learning gains.

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

Citrus Elementary's ESSA Subgroup SWD shows 7% achievement in ELA and 19% achievement in Math. Our Subgroup SWD is in the greatest need of improvement. These data points trail behind in comparison to district and state achievement levels.

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

In order to support the inclusion model with fidelity, Citrus Elementary has expanded its dedicated resources to allow for an increased time for both support facilitation and pull-out. In addition, inclusion classroom teachers will meet monthly with the ESE teacher, content area coaches, and administration for collaborative purposes and improved activities aligned to both standard and IEP goals. Lastly, 1 day of common planning for inclusion teams is provided each quarter.

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

Citrus Elementary experienced increases in all seven components- ELA achievement, ELA learning gains, ELA 25%, Math achievement, Math learning gains, Math 25%, and Science resulting in a 146-point increase. Most notable in this increase was a 39% increase in ELA learning gains and a 29% increase in both Math learning gains and Math lowest 25%.

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

There were multiple adjustments that occurred going into the 2021-2022 school year. Citrus Elementary utilized ESSR-funded Tier I Interventionist positions, pushing into classrooms during small-group instruction to support current standards-mastery. Citrus Elementary departmentalized 4th and 5th grade based on teacher common assessment data. Citrus Elementary incorporated an ELA walk-to-intervention for grades 1-5, triangulating data to align instruction to individualized student needs. PLCs were re-designed to focus on assessment mapping and data analysis. Citrus Elementary also partnered with the Florida Inclusion Network, allowing the school to adopt an inclusion model for our ESSA Subgroup SWD.



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

Citrus Elementary will continue with the instructional adjustments from the prior year which lead to the school's substantial gains. However, adjustment to and expanding the school's ESE inclusion model will be a focus in order to improve ESSA Subgroup SWD's overall ELA and Math achievement.

**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.**

To accelerate learning for Citrus Elementary's ESSA Subgroup SWD, inclusion classroom teachers will meet monthly with the ESE teacher and administration for collaborative purposes. Additionally, 1 day of common planning for inclusion teams is provided each quarter. Citrus Elementary has partnered with the Florida Inclusion Network to provide further support and professional development for inclusion teachers and best practices. Professional development related to IEP/504 compliance, accommodations use and documentation and child find are also embedded on the professional development calendar for this school year.

To accelerate learning for Citrus Elementary's overall Math achievement, the school will embed professional development during the school year to reinforce best practices and intervention strategies.

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

A Reading Specialist has been added to the staff of Citrus Elementary to support closing the achievement gap in the area of Reading. Pull-out has been added to our school-wide ESE model to assist with foundational skills practice and IEP goals. Small group instruction will continue to remain a focus with school-wide Tier I push-in.

**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 Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

Although Math noticed significant growth over the prior year, with achievement, learning gains, and bottom 25% increasing by 14%, 29%, and 19%, respectively, in the bottom 25% we only saw learning gains in 45% of identified students.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

As 2022-2023 is a baseline year- due to the transition from FSA to FAST- without the ability to determine learning gains, Citrus Elementary will utilize FAST progress monitoring throughout the course of the year to ascertain growth in our bottom 25%. This year, we anticipate seeing 65% of our bottom 25% demonstrate growth toward proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring of this desired outcome will involve an array of data points. First, FAST assessments will serve as progress monitoring and end results. Additional data points accumulated throughout the year will involve iReady, SBUAs, and Tiered data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

Citrus will follow a 45-minute core instruction with a 30-minute intervention block. Standards-based resources- envision, district CRMs- will be used during Tier I, core instruction. iReady will be incorporated into small group rotations as adaptive support to close gaps between student-level and grade-level standards. Resources from district CRMs will be used during intervention time, with groupings based on triangulated data- iReady, SBUAs, and FAST progress monitoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

These resources were selected due to their alignment with BEST standards and founded on research.

**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.

The school principal will ensure appropriate time is dedicated to the master schedule.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Opportunities are created in advance of the school year for professional development in the areas of Math BEST standards and selected standards-based resources, enVision.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

FAST PM1 and iReady initial assessments are implemented to determine student needs in small groups and intervention.

**Person Responsible** Tiffany Payne (tiffany.payne@ocps.net)

Math coach supports teachers to ensure BEST standards-based instruction is planned for via PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Daniel St. Onge (daniel.stonge@ocps.net)

Math intervention is developed by analyzing beginning-of-year data. Groups are created based on student needs. The math coach uses CRM resources and iReady supplemental instructional resources to create intervention lessons for grade levels.

**Person Responsible** Daniel St. Onge (daniel.stonge@ocps.net)

Monitoring of school-wide Math will be conducted on a weekly basis via classroom walk-throughs, teacher input via PLCs, and SBUA data. Adjustments throughout the year will occur based on all data points.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

The Federal Index for ESSA Subgroup SWD is identified at 31%. This is below the 41% threshold.

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

According to 2022-2023 FSA ELA data, 7% of ESSA Subgroup SWD demonstrated proficiency, while 50% demonstrated learning gains. Our goal this year is to improve to 41% as measured by the spring FAST assessment.

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

Monitoring of this desired outcome will involve an array of data points. First, FAST assessments will serve as progress monitoring and end results. Additional data points accumulated throughout the year will involve i-Ready and SBUs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Citrus will follow a 90-minute, uninterrupted Reading block, with 30 minutes dedicated to whole group instruction and 60 minutes dedicated to small group instruction. Citrus will partner with Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) to develop the inclusion model to directly support students on an IEP within small group Reading time. In core instruction, we will use standards-based resources- Wonders, and district-approved CRMs. Our ESE teacher will differentiate instruction to ensure standards-aligned learning as well as meet the respective students' IEP goals. Tier I interventionists will support small group instruction. iReady will be incorporated into small group instruction as well as adaptive technology

**implemented for this Area of Focus.** support to close gaps between current student levels and grade-level standards. Wonders tier 2 resources will be used during intervention time, with groupings based on triangulated data- iReady, SBUAs, and FAST progress monitoring.

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

These resources were selected due to their alignment with BEST standards and founded in research.

**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.

The school principal will ensure appropriate time is dedicated to Reading via the master schedule.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

The school principal will meet with FIN and the ESE team to assess the needs of students with an IEP who receive direct instructional support. The inclusion schedule will then be built around the master schedule based on this information with a focus on small group Reading.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

The Tier I and school-wide small group push-in schedule are then created with a focus on small group instruction in both Reading and Math.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Ongoing opportunities for professional development and adequate inclusion team planning will be provided to ensure the inclusion model is implemented with fidelity. Inclusive of this is IEP goal analysis, current grade level benchmark, and planned small group activity to meet the needs of the student.

**Person Responsible** Katie Harrison (katie.harrison@ocps.net)

Monitoring of the inclusion model will occur on a weekly basis via classroom walk-through, MTSS data, SBUAs, and i-Ready. Adjustments to the inclusion model will occur based on data gathered.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

## 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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determination the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. These individuals include but aren't limited to students, families, teachers, community partners, the Parent Teacher Association, and the School Advisory Council.