Inverness Primary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Inverness Primary School

206 S LINE AVE, Inverness, FL 34452

https://ips.citrusschools.org/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we commit to building a safe, responsible and nurturing learning environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring lifelong learners and creating responsible citizens.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

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 instruction and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment conducive to learning and student success.
Hengesbach, Brian	Assistant Principal	To deal with 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 is responsible for brining 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

To involve stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process, the following process was followed:
The school admin team team organized a planning day where stakeholders were invited to attend in the planning process. This included members of our School Advisory Council as well as teachers, school

staff, parents, and community members. The school admin team communicated with all stakeholders about the SIP process. This included sharing the timeline, purpose and goals of the process. The school admin team gathered input from all stakeholders through surveys, focus groups, and meetings. The input collected on topics such as school strengths, areas of improvement, and potential solutions. The school admin team analyzed the input collected from all stakeholders to identify areas of focus.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through analyzing relevant data on student achievement, including academic performance, progress monitoring data, standardized test scores, and other indicators. To ensure continuous improvement, the school will monitor results and stakeholder feedback and revise as needed.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	23	16	36	29	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	2	4	7	5	4	6	0	0	0	28
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	7	11	1	3	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	4	5	6	4	1	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	18	7	11	14	16	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	23	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	21	29	22	28	0	0	0	101

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	27	29	28	28	24	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	3	2	6	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	11	24	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	18	25	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	14	14	26	16	23	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	6	10	1	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	27	29	28	28	24	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	3	2	6	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	11	24	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	18	25	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	14	14	26	16	23	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	6	10	1	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	51	53	47	53	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				55			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			30		
Math Achievement*	58	55	59	52	52	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				49			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			29		
Science Achievement*	48	49	54	31	53	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					48	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	191
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	2	2
HSP	65			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	78			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	44			58			48					
SWD	33			38			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			25							2	
HSP	59			71							2	
MUL	27			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			58			49				4	
FRL	35			55			37				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	55	65	52	49	39	31					
SWD	32	47		38	47							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	5	50		30	33							
HSP	82			73								
MUL	45			27								
PAC												
WHT	49	52	59	54	52	39	35					
FRL	42	52	62	47	44	35	27					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	41	30	56	48	29	40					
SWD	42	54		50	23		23					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			48								
HSP	79			79								
MUL	42			27								
PAC												
WHT	58	44	27	57	47	29	42					
FRL	50	36	33	50	38	29	31					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	54%	-9%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	49%	-4%	51%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

3rd grade reading showed the lowest performance. The contributing factors to last year's low performance was behaviors, students entered 3rd grade with a lower proficiency, lack of academic vocabulary, lack of phonics, and low stamina in reading. Another possible factor is new test platform.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

5th grade math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The contributing factors were lack of math fluency, math academic vocabulary, and no consistency with math strategy implementation. We also had new benchmarks and many felt there was a lack of professional development. Another possible factor is a larger ESE population in 5th grade.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

5th grade had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. IPS scored 45% proficiency and the state was at 55%. The contributing factors were lack of math fluency, math academic vocabulary, no consistency with math strategy implementation, and lack of differentiated instruction. There is a consistent decrease in math scores for this cohort for the last 3 years.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

3rd grade math showed the most improvement. The new actions IPS took in this area were: tutoring, technology games, spiral reviews, observations, modeling best practices, collaborative planning and reteaching skills after PM2.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is attendance. We had 133 students who missed 10% or more days. The second concern is the number of students scoring a level 1 in ELA.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1) Increase ELA Achievement
2) Increase Math Achievement
3) Increase Science Achievement
4) Positive School Culture

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our overall ELA proficiency is stagnant.

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

During the 23-24 school year, we will increase proficiency levels in ELA from 48% to 54%.

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

Through walkthroughs and observations, collaborative planning with the administrative team, data based decision making and differentiated professional development for instructional staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize research-based curriculum to provide instruction to all students. Utilize iReady and Wonders with all students. Use Reading Horizons for K-2 phonics instruction. Incorporate high quality student collaboration and daily small group instruction. Instructional Coaching to model best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of research-based curriculum consistently will positively impact student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Utilize iReady and Wonders in the ELA block with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

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

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Utilize instructional coach to provide professional development and modeling on B.E.S.T. ELA Expectations as well as the instructional framework.

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Daily small group instruction based on student need.

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

5th grade math proficiency continues to decrease each year.

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

During the 23-24 school year, we will increase 5th grade proficiency levels in Math from 45% to 54%.

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

Through walkthroughs and observations, collaborative planning with the administrative team, data based decision making and differentiated professional development for instructional staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize research-based curriculum to provide instruction to all students. Utilize iReady with all students. Use iReady resources to intervene with identified students. Incorporate high quality student collaboration through vertical learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of research based curriculum consistently will positively impact student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Utilize Savvas in the Math block with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Ongoing professional development on B.E.S.T. standards and utilizing the B1G-M and MTRs for instructional planning.

Person Responsible: Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Daily small group math instruction.

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
Although our Science proficiency has increased from 22-23, IPS still falls below the state and district average.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
During the 23-24 school year, we will increase proficiency levels in Science from 45% to 54%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Through walkthroughs and observations as well as collaborative planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Increase hands on Science experiments and implement Study Island consistently.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
By providing real world experiences with the Nature of Science, students will have a better understanding of Science application.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence
Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No
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.
Study Island incentives for classroom use and school wide.
Person Responsible: Brian Hengesbach (hengesbachb@citrusschools.org)
By When: May 2024
STEAM Night with Professor Wilson who provides hands on learning.
Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)
By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 22-23 school year, 20% of our students had attendance below 90 percent.

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

During the 23-24 school year, we will decrease the number of students with attendance less than 90%.

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

School Counselor, Kerry Krantz, will monitor student attendance weekly and share data monthly at an Admin team meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize skyward tracking system to help monitor student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that missing 10% of school or about 18 days, negatively affects a student's academic performance. Every day a student is absent is a lost opportunity for learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Celebrating student attendance on the morning show.

Person Responsible: Brian Hengesbach (hengesbachb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Incentivizing perfect attendance with PBIS points monthly.

Person Responsible: Brian Hengesbach (hengesbachb@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 23-24 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 targeted subgroup using iReady and FAST assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA block using research based strategies for whole group and small group. Students will also utilize iReady daily with differentiated instruction in order to close performance gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is an evidenced based program that is targeted to meet student individual needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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: Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

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. Monitor data sheets and the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible: Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 23-24 school year, we will increase achievement level of the subgroup of Multi-racial students from 36% 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA Block using evidence-based Wonders for whole group and small group instruction. Students will also utilize Curriculum Associates iReady daily with differentiated instruction in order to close performance gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is an evidenced based program that is targeted to meet student individual needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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: Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

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 during the intervention block. Monitor data sheets and the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible: Alexis Cochran (cochrana@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

IPS will review school funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on the highest needs. The budget was shared with our School Advisory Council to collect input from our stakeholders. All materials purchased must be evidence based and specifically targeted to help us meet our SIP goals.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 our 2023 STAR data, we will increase the %of K-2 students scoring on grade level or above on STAR 67% to 85%.

Phonics is the biggest area of concern for first grade students. While students demonstrated success in phonemic awareness, decoding and word building continues to be an area in need of further development. Professional Development for phonics instruction and small group instruction will be provided to teachers in K-2 to support development in foundational skills.

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

According to our 2023 FSA data, the percentage of students who scored below a Level 3 in grade 3 was 58%, grade 4 had 48% who scored below a Level 3, and grade 5 had 48% who scored below a Level 3.

IPS will provide professional development in student discourse and collaboration to increase teacher knowledge content in student engagement strategies.

We will also focus on Essential Questions that are higher order thinking and require higher order student responses.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

During the 23-24 school year, we will increase the percent of K-2 students scoring at or above grade level on Star Reading from 67% to 75%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

During the 23-24 school year, we will increase the percent of students achieving a level 3 or higher in ELA from 48% to 54%.

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

We will progress monitor using iReady online instruction. This data will be analyzed during team meetings to help guide instruction. 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.

Merchant, Bridget, merchantb@citrusschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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:
-Wonders: Promising Evidence (Source- Evidence for ESSA)
-Curriculum Associates- iReady: Promising Evidence (Source- Evidence for ESSA)
-Daily small group instruction following the literacy framework
-Instructional Coach to support classroom instruction

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs we are using are evidence based and differentiated in order to meet students need. The use of an instructional coach is research-based in supporting instruction effectively.

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.	Merchant, Bridget, merchantb@citrusschools.org
IPS Instructional Coach will conduct ELA Coaching where she models best instructional practices and evidence based practices.	Cochran, Alexis, cochrana@citrusschools.org
IPS Instructional Coach will facilitate Professional Learning to support instruction. Through collaborative planning, both general and special education teachers will have the opportunity to plan and implement best strategies for all learners.	Cochran, Alexis, cochrana@citrusschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The dissemination of this SIP will be shared with stakeholders through our School Advisory Council, shared with school staff and on our school website. As a school community, we will revisit the SIP several times to check our progress.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

IPS will host several events throughout the year to build the capacity for strong family engagement to support a partnership among the school, parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement. All events are listed on our IPS Family Engagement Plan which is housed on our school website at https://ips.citrusschools.org/.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

IPS will provide opportunities to improve family engagement to help support student learning. For each student we are committed to creating an environment that nurtures a lifelong desire to learn. We will provide a continuum of learning experiences that are focused on the needs of the students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A