

Citrus County Schools

Central Ridge Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Central Ridge Elementary School

185 W CITRUS SPRINGS BLVD, Citrus Springs, FL 34434

<https://cre.citruschools.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.

As a community dedicated to student success, we are committed to building respectful relationships through communication and teamwork while providing an engaging environment that fosters excellence in life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Committed to Reaching Excellence

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
Ramallo, Sarahy	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 safe, caring, and enriching environment conducive to learning and student success.
Darby, Gillian	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students to carry out the mission and goals of the school and district.
Williams, Leona	School Counselor	To help overcome problems that impeded learning and to assist students in making educational, occupational, and life plans that will enhance their personal fulfillment as mature men and woman.
	Staffing Specialist	To assist students and families with disabilities who are currently being evaluated or/in the Exceptional Student Education program with varying exceptionalities to overcome academic challenges that impeded learning. To assist teachers and staff with providing accommodations, resources, and data tracking tools to help our students be as successful as they can throughout their educational career.
Anderson, Maria	Instructional Coach	To plan, implement, and assist with the coordination of an effective instructional program while supporting teachers with curriculum, state-wide testing, and state led initiatives.

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.

All Stakeholders, parents, teachers, and support staff were invited to participate in our SIP planning for the 2023-2024 school year. All stakeholders were strategically placed into groups so that varying points of view were acknowledged during the deaggregation of grade-level data, school survey data, and FAST data. During this process stakeholders were asked to disseminate information into 3 categories:

1. What do you notice?
2. What are the implications of the data, how is it significant?
3. What are some potential solutions or actions?

The following observations were made by all stakeholders in these areas:

Areas of success Top 3 in each group:

Parents: The school's vision, mission and beliefs are clearly focused on student success. My child feels accepted and feels a sense of belonging at school. Adults at my child's school respect the values, beliefs, and abilities of others.

Staff: Ours School's vision, mission & beliefs are clearly focused on student success. A formal structure exists so that each student is well-known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student's educational experience. Our school leaders monitor and share data related to student achievement and school improvement throughout the year.

Students: Adults at my school want to see me be successful. In my school, I can participate in activities that interest me. I have at least one adult at school who knows me well and shows interest in my education and my future.

In the 2022-2023 Parent, Staff and Student Surveys the following CLIMATE, CULTURE, & LEADERSHIP areas of improvement:

Parents: Students in my child's school show respect for others (26% in the red).

Staff: Students in our school show respect for others (40% in the red).

Students: In my school, students treat others with respect (59% in the red).

Implementation that will take place for the 2023-2024 school year that requires showing respect :

Weekly morning show conversations/topics with guidance and SRO.

Safety patrol of the month on the morning show that displays positive attributes.

Positive referrals read in front of classmates but also phone calls home.

In the 2022-2023 Parent, Staff and Student Surveys the following CLIMATE, CULTURE, & LEADERSHIP areas of improvement:

Parents: My child feels accepted and feels a sense of belonging at school. (9%)

Staff: I feel a sense of belonging in my school community. (22%)

Students: In my school, I feel accepted by others. (23%)

Implementation that will take place for the 2023-2024 school year that will provide a sense of belonging:

Continue to provide parent/student Character Luncheons monthly.

Promote the Sunshine Club memberships and have 2 teachers lead the club.

First Friday Breakfast

Learning Sessions and Sharing Sessions will provide cross content experiences will build relationships and connections to each other.

Sunday callouts that communicate upcoming school events.

Weekly staff newsletter and monthly parent newsletters.
 Highlights of school/classroom events in social media

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))

Our SIP for the 2023-2024 school year is a fluid document that will guide our professional developments, data deaggregation throughout quarterly data-day analysis with teachers, Curriculum Associates support, and SAC involvement. Providing teachers and faculty with mid-year surveys and end-of-the year surveys to monitor progress towards school-wide and district initiatives.

Our leadership team and core team will meet weekly, in addition to our Instructional Leadership team meeting monthly, to review data, make suggestions, and accountability check-in process (through meetings and walk-throughs) that allows us to align our school goals/initiatives with our SIP goals.

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	28%
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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	27	26	21	24	23	24	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	4	13	3	3	1	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	23	15	3	19	1	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	14	19	2	29	2	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	21	22	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	26	29	0	0	0	61
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	14	31	20	18	15	21	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	4	4	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	10	15	9	8	6	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	5	10	8	12	7	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	15	21	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	36	28	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	9	13	15	21	0	0	0	63

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	2	22	18	22	24	24	0	0	0	112

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	14	7	20	1	0	0	0	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5

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	14	31	20	18	15	21	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	4	4	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	10	15	9	8	6	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	5	10	8	12	7	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	15	21	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	36	28	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	9	13	15	21	0	0	0	63

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	2	22	18	22	24	24	0	0	0	112

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	14	7	20	1	0	0	0	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5

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*	53	51	53	51	53	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				56			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			27		
Math Achievement*	52	55	59	48	52	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				64			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			15		
Science Achievement*	54	49	54	45	53	59	41		
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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	208
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
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	10	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	55			

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%
FRL	45			

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	48			
MUL	36	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	51			

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	53			52			54					
SWD	9			7			18				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			32			27				3	
HSP	42			39			50				3	
MUL	63			50							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	57			55			57				4	
FRL	48			43			42				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	51	56	55	48	64	56	45					
SWD	21	39	43	16	64	56	17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	62		25	62							
HSP	50	50		44	59		38					
MUL	43			29								
PAC												
WHT	52	57	62	50	66	56	45					
FRL	46	54	57	41	62	59	37					

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	44	44	27	43	36	15	41					
SWD	23	27	23	27	36		24					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			28								
HSP	40	43		30	31		32					
MUL	54			54								
PAC												
WHT	45	46	28	45	35	11	42					
FRL	40	39	24	38	33	15	36					

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	60%	57%	3%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	62%	-10%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	49%	4%	51%	2%

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.

CRE's 3rd Grade ELA fell below the district and state indicators for all three PM1, PM2, and PM3 on FAST.

Level 1's went from 59% to 42% to 25 % decreasing 34 percentage points

Level 2 & Level 3's went from 36% to 47% to 55% growth increasing 19 percentage points

Level 4 & Level 5's went from 5% to 10% to 21% growth increasing 16 percentage points

The number of Level 1's decreased and most of the growth was in Level 2's and Level 3's

4th Grade ELA PM1 CRE fell below the district and state, however in PM2 and PM3 CRE was above the

district and state.

Level 1's went from 35% to 32% to 23% decreasing 12 percentage points
Level 2 & Level 3's went from 52% to 41% to 44% decreasing 8 percentage points
Level 4 & Level 5's went from 12% to 26% to 34% growth increasing 22 percentage points

The number of Level 2's and Level 3's were decreased but the numbers of Level 4's and Level 5's were increased.

5th Grade ELA

PM1 CRE was above the district and state however in PM2 we fell below and in PM3 CRE was above the district and state.

Level 1's went from 35% to 17% to 18% decreasing 17 percentage points
Level 2 & Level 3's went from 54% to 61% to 50% decreasing 4 percentage points
Level 4 & Level 5's went from 12% to 22% to 32% growth increasing 20 percentage points

The number of Level 2's and Level 3's were decreased but the numbers of Level 4's and Level 5's were increased.

Contributing Factors: Departmentalization in 3rd Grade, reading comprehension strategies were not part of school-wide vision agreement, school-wide annotation marks, test taking strategies, and test blueprints were not provided to staff within the first semester. In addition, CRE school-wide belief statements were not developed/shared and discontinuing a growth for all model during interventions, due to loss of transitional time impacting instructional time.

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

Third Grade ELA was our lowest indicator on FAST decreasing 7% from 57% proficiency to 45% proficiency, and falling below both the state and district indicators.

Contributing Factors: Departmentalization in 3rd Grade, reading comprehension strategies were not part of school-wide vision agreement, school-wide annotation marks, test taking strategies, and test blueprints were not provided to staff within the first semester. In addition, CRE school-wide belief statements were not developed/shared and discontinuing a growth for all model during interventions, due to loss of instructional time. vs. transitional time.

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.

Third Grade ELA showed the largest gap compared to the state average. Third Grade ELA was 45% proficient and the state was 50% proficient causing a 5% gap. Third Grade Math was at 52% proficient and the state average for proficiency was 59%, causing a 7% gap below the state indicator. Fourth Grade Math scored 53% proficiency and the state proficiency was at 61% which caused an 8% gap below the state indicator.

Focused reading comprehension strategies were not part of school-wide vision agreement, school-wide annotation marks, test taking strategies, and test blueprints were not provided to staff within the first semester. Essential questions were not posted and used to guide instruction in each content area daily.

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

Fifth Grade ELA increased from 43% proficiency to 60% proficiency, causing a 17% increase, ranking 6% points above the State of Florida indicator.

The actions at CRE that led to an increase were implementation of PBIS, monthly support through Curriculum Associates, and the benchmark breakdown report provided by the FAST portal for teacher information to guide instruction.

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

According to the EWS data a total of 54 students have been identified as receiving a level 1 in grades 3-5 in the ELA FAST assessment, and 61 students received a level 1 in the Math FAST assessment.

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

First and foremost, our top priorities are Grades one and three from previous school year, making these students in Grades two and four. These students will be monitored closely, the number of walk-throughs increased from 5 to 10 in ELA and 5 in math weekly.

Develop a school-wide reading strategies common language that begins with our youngest learners in Pre-K through Fifth Grade. Continue implementation of UFLI with fidelity, and consistency in practices using only state and district adopted curriculum. All students will have access to our Reflex lab through our specials rotation wheel, in addition to utilizing this resource in their classrooms.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

An area of focus pertaining to teacher retention and recruitment, specifically to provide a sense of belonging to our schools culture, climate, and environment all of our students, staff, and families.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to retain 80% of our faculty for the 2023-2024 school year, and forthcoming school years. An increase from 78% to 80% of our staff survey data reflecting that our faculty feels a sense of belonging in our school community.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus through our yearly parent, staff, student CRE survey, and total teacher retention at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gillian Darby (darbyg@citruschools.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.)

Research indicated that teachers who are mentored who receive higher ratings from their principals develop better planning skills, handle discipline problems more effectively, conduct more productive classroom decisions, and remain in classrooms longer than teachers who are simply left to "sink or swim." Veteran teachers who serve as mentors report increased professional revitalization, less isolation, greater recognition, and a belief that they impact the profession more than teachers who are not involved in mentoring professionals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has provided evidence that novice teachers in support of school environments that receive strong induction program and monitoring support have better retention rates and greater confidence in their teaching abilities.

Stanford Research Institute 2008

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.

Implementation that will take place for the 2023-2024 school year that will provide a sense of belonging:
Continue to provide parent/student Character Luncheons monthly.
Promote the Sunshine Club memberships and have 2 teachers lead the club.

First Friday Breakfast

Learning Sessions and Sharing Sessions will provide cross content experiences will build relationships and connections to each other.

Sunday callouts that communicate upcoming school events.

Weekly staff newsletter and monthly parent newsletters.

Highlights of school/classroom events in social media

Monthly TIP meetings focused on school-wide initiatives

Person Responsible: Gillian Darby (darbyg@citruschools.org)

By When: Beginning August 2023 and concluding in May, 2024.

#2. 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.

Third Grade ELA was our lowest indicator on FAST data decreasing 7% from 57% proficiency to 45% proficiency, and falling below both the state and district indicators. Thus, also being identified as one of RAISE indicators.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a school, we are going to increase Third Grade ELA FAST data increasing 5% points. Overall, meeting or exceeding the state indicator.

Monitoring:

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

Increasing 50% of our ELA walk-throughs, from 5 walk-throughs to 10 a week.

School-wide learning and sharing professional development sessions.

School-wide implementation of reading comprehension strategies.

School-wide implementation of repeated use of annotation marks.

Essential Questions will be posted and used to guide instruction daily in all content areas.

Evidence of students responding in writing to essential question daily, teachers will use as a formative assessment to guide their instruction moving forward.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.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, in alignment with the district literacy framework which includes designated times for whole group instruction using rigorous, evidence based BEST standards aligned, Wonders curriculum, and differentiated small group instruction. There will be an increased focus on comprehension, specifically Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. Reading interventions utilizing evidence based iReady resources, and UFLI to address student deficit areas will be implemented for students showing a need based on iReady, ESGI, and FAST progress monitoring data. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 45 minute iReady reading sessions weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because the instructional materials and structures have proven effective in many districts throughout the state and demographically comparable districts. The use of a structured ELA block and rigorous, evidence based instructional materials will help to increase student performance.

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.

Comprehension Connections Book Study

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: Implementation will happen throughout the school year, conclusion of book study will be in February, 2024.

Analyze data monthly during collaboration with grade-level teams, quarterly with instructional coach and staffing specialist. iReady, FAST progress monitoring, UFLI, classroom grades and walk-through data.

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: Beginning in August 2023 throughout the school year, conclusion will be in May, 2024.

Implement iReady extended support.

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: This implementation begin in September, 2023 and will continue throughout the year to include data chat days.

#3. 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.

Based on our data review, increasing student proficiency levels has been identified as a critical area of focus for Central Ridge Elementary School. While our proficiency levels have fallen below the district and the state in Third Grade currently 52%, state average was 59%. In Fourth Grade proficiency level was 53% and the state proficiency level at 61% for FAST data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This year we will be increasing our proficiency by 5% points in both third and fourth grade math. With an overall goal of meeting or exceeding the state average.

Monitoring:

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

We will implement the B1G M with tiered instructional support embedded, Savvas intervention kit, and increasing the number of weekly walk-throughs with fidelity to 5. iReady toolbox and resources, REFLEX and FRAX program embedded into math instruction as well as a rotation on our specials wheel. Our master schedule was designed with a math intervention block.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.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 math block which includes designated times for whole group instruction using rigorous, evidence based, Savvas curriculum (Minimum 30 minutes daily) to teach BEST math standards, apply MTR's throughout the math lesson, and differentiated small group instruction and math interventions to address student deficit areas. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 45 minute math sessions weekly on iReady.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because the instructional materials and structures have proven effective in many districts throughout the state and including demographically comparable districts. The use of a structured math block and rigorous, evidence based instructional materials will help to increase student performance.

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.

Implement BEST math standards with B1G M tiered instructional support, along with MTR's, and utilizing Savvas math intervention kits. The use of math essential questions to guide instruction.

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: Beginning August, 2023 and continued until May, 2024.

Analyze math data regularly:

iReady;

Fast Progress Monitoring;

Use of REFLEX and FRAX;

Classroom Grades;

Math Classroom Walk-throughs; and

Opportunities for students to respond in writing to math essential questions daily.

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: Beginning in August, 2023 and concluding in May, 2024.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

One area of focus at CRE regarding our subgroups is our SWD students, which performed below the Federal Index Level of 37%, and our Multiracial subgroup, which also performed below the Federal Index Level of 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our SWD and Multiracial subgroups will perform above the 41% Federal Index level.

Monitoring:

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

The following actions will be taking place for our students that performed below the Federal Index Level (SWD and Multiracial subgroup) so that they can receive the support needed to achieve higher academic status and not perform below the Federal Index Level:

- The use of iReady resources in order to adjust instructional intervention practices to increase student achievement
- Afterschool and before school tutoring will be provided in order to provide more opportunities to reteach, remediate and enrich student learning
- Extra paraprofessional support to target the students that are in the SWD and multiracial subgroups using small group, explicit instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.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 math and ELA block which includes designated times for whole group instruction using rigorous, evidence based, Savvas curriculum (Minimum 30 minutes daily) to teach BEST math standards, apply MTR's throughout the math lesson, and differentiated small group instruction and math interventions to address student deficit areas. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 45 minute math sessions weekly on iReady. The ELA block, in alignment with the district literacy framework includes whole group instruction using rigorous, evidence based BEST standards aligned, Wonders curriculum, and differentiated small group instruction. An increased focus on comprehension, specifically Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. Reading interventions utilizing evidence based iReady resources, and UFLI to address student deficit areas will be implemented for students showing a need based on iReady, ESGI, and FAST progress monitoring data. Students will complete a minimum of 45 minute iReady reading sessions weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because the instructional materials and structures have proven effective in many districts throughout the state and including demographically comparable districts. The use of a structured math and ELA block and rigorous, evidence based instructional materials will help to increase student performance.

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.

-Comprehension Connections Book Study

-Implement BEST math standards with B1G M tiered instructional support, along with MTR's, and utilizing Savvas math intervention kits. The use of math essential questions to guide instruction.

Analyze math data regularly:

iReady;

Fast Progress Monitoring;

Use of REFLEX and FRAX;

Classroom Grades;

Math Classroom Walk-throughs; and

Opportunities for students to respond in writing to math essential questions daily.

Person Responsible: Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

By When: Beginning August, 2023 and continued until 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).

The following allocations are used to ensure that our students whom are at risk receive a plethora of support to achieve higher academic improvement:

- iReady support/coaching in order to adjust instructional intervention practices to increase student achievement

- Afterschool and before school tutoring will be provided for students in the MTSS/at risk in order to provide more opportunities to reteach, remediate and enrich student learning

-The purchase of extra paraprofessional support for our school to target the classrooms and support teachers and students with small group, explicit instruction.

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

Based on our data review, increasing student proficiency levels in ELA for K-2 has been identified as a critical area of focus as identified by The Florida Department of Education. According to the data, 58% of first graders are performing at a Level 1 or Level 2.

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

Based on our data review, increasing student proficiency levels in ELA for 3-5 has been identified as a critical area of focus as identified by The Florida Department of Education. According to the data, 54% of third graders are performing at a Level 1 or Level 2.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

K-2 students ELA proficiency will show an increase of 5% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring tool. Overall, 51% of our K-2 students will demonstrate a Level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3-5 students ELA proficiency will show an increase of 5% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring tool. Overall, 51% of our 3-5 students will demonstrate a Level 3 or higher.

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.

FAST Progress Monitoring Tool;
 UFLI;
 iReady;
 Quarterly data days;
 Teacher Lesson; and
 Walk-Through Data

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ramallo, Sarahy, ramallos@citruschools.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?

Daily instruction will be delivered in a structured ELA block, in alignment with the district literacy framework, which includes designated times for whole group instruction using rigorous, evidence based BEST standards aligned, Wonders curriculum, and differentiated small group instruction. There will be an increased focus on foundation reading skills to help prevent gaps in learning.

There will be an increased focus on comprehension, specifically The Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary benchmarks.

Reading interventions utilizing evidence based UFLI and iReady resources to address student deficit areas will be implemented for students showing a need based on iReady, ESGI, UFLI, and FAST progress monitoring data. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 45 minute iReady reading sessions weekly.

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?

This strategy was selected because the instructional materials and structures have proven effective in many districts throughout the state including demographically comparable districts. The use of a structured ELA block and rigorous, evidence based instructional materials, will help to increase student performance.

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
Instructional staff will utilize data from FAST, Ready, and UFLI to make informative instructional decisions that will propel instruction forward.	Ramallo, Sarahy, ramallos@citruschools.org
Interventions will be differentiated to each student and skill needed, data will be monitored and student progress will be tracked in order to assist in closing the instructional gap that is identified for each student.	Ramallo, Sarahy, ramallos@citruschools.org
Analyze data monthly during collaboration sessions and quarterly with the Instructional Coach. Using the following resources to monitor: iReady, UFLI, FAST progress monitoring, classroom grades, data sheets, and Walk-through data	Ramallo, Sarahy, ramallos@citruschools.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 School Improvement Plan committee met to disseminate school-wide date during the summer and will meet throughout the school year. Also, parents, teachers, and community members will met and will continue to meet throughout the school year to revisit the School Improvement Plan. All stakeholders will be/have been given academic data as well as school survey data to continue to plan and implement best practices.

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))

The School Improvement Plan will be shared with all stakeholders. Teachers will meet with parents and share student academic data before the first semester concludes and will continue to communicate with parents throughout the school year whether through Class Dojo, Skyward, parent phone calls, via emails, and/or student planners to inform parents of school activities and/or student academic achievement. The school will provide weekly call outs, text, and email to inform parents of upcoming school events.

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)

Our school has implemented a STEAM wheel where students will work 2 days out of the week, when attending this class, on a makerspace/STEAM activity. Also, tutoring before school will be offered to struggling students so that they can build automaticity with math facts as well as build knowledge with fractions. Teachers are going to implement the evidence base Science of Reading strategies as well as school-wide comprehensions strategies.

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))

The following TITLE 1 allocations are used to ensure that our students whom are at risk receive a plethora of support to achieve higher academic improvement:

- iReady support/coaching in order to adjust instructional intervention practices to increase student achievement
- Afterschool and before school tutoring will be provided for students in the MTSS/at risk in order to provide more opportunities to reteach, remediate and enrich student learning
- The purchase of extra paraprofessional support for our school to target the classrooms and support teachers and students with small group, explicit instruction.