# Floral City Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Floral City Elementary School

## 8457 E MARVIN ST, Floral City, FL 34436

## https://fce.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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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.**

Working hand in hand so all students succeed.

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

We envision Floral City Elementary School as a model of instructional excellence, where all students are self-advocates of their learning, safety, and social-emotional well-being. Our school family will equip students with the strategies and skills to be successful in secondary education.

We are committed to providing an exceptional learning environment for our students, refining our instructional practices, and raising overall student achievement.

During our school improvement planning, we identified three areas of focus for the upcoming school year.
1: Curriculum and Instruction to Improve Student Growth - Special Focus on ESE and BQ Students
2: Attendance
3: Social and emotional needs

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Adams, Bart | Principal | Instructional Evaluations<br>School Improvement Plan<br>SAEC<br>Professional Learning<br>School Budget<br>Master Schedule<br>Staffing<br>Master Calendar Approval<br>Health Insurance Chair<br>Crisis Alert |
| Furniss, Megan | Assistant Principal | Instructional Evaluations<br>School and Bus Discipline<br>Threat Assessments<br>ESOL<br>Employee Time Off Requests<br>Assessments:<br>-State Assessments<br>-Performance Matters<br>-iReady<br>-Data Source<br>Instructional Coach |
| Palma-Hughes, Jeanne | School Counselor | Intervention/Groups<br>Push In Lessons<br>Truancy and Attendance<br>504s<br>DCF Contact<br>Self-Harm Reports<br>Family Support<br>Outreach<br>Mental Health Requirements |
| Carone, Donna | Staffing Specialist | Maintaining IEP's for all ESE students<br>VPK<br>REACH Oversight<br>Assessment Support<br>PST Meetings |
| Blocker, Meg | Teacher, ESE | Intervention Supervisor<br>Title 1 Contact |

**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.


SAC Input:
We asked for input during our May SAC meeting for any parents and/or students that could not attend our July 17 Strategic Planning Day. We had 8 staff, 7 parents, 2 business owners, and 3 students in attendance.
July 17th SIP Development Day
We invited all staff, parents, students, and local businesses through emails, callouts. and posting the event on our school marque. 19 were present for our SIP development and our meeting lasted approx. 4 hours. Administration, staff, parents, students, business owners, and even one of our School Board Members were represented for our SIP development

**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 will be reviewed monthly with staff at grade level meetings. We can discuss progress towards goals and how we are meeting our students' needs. We can revise as needed upon looking at the goals and our data. This will continue at the weekly Leadership Team meetings. We will provide quarterly updates at our SAC meetings throughout the year.

| **Demographic Data**<br>Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | Yes |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 17% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>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 | 0 | 17 | 16 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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 | 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 | 22 | 19 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

**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 | 27 | 26 | 14 | 20 | 23 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 5 | 23 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

**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 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 27 | 26 | 14 | 20 | 23 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 5 | 23 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

**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 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 53 | 53 | 56 | 53 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 42 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59 | | | 25 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 52 | 55 | 59 | 52 | 52 | 50 | 47 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 55 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52 | | | 50 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 42 | 49 | 54 | 51 | 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.

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 168 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 382 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 15 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | | | |

| 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 | 38 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 44 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| 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 | 44 | | | 52 | | | 42 | | | | | |
| SWD | 15 | | | 22 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | | | 67 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | 46 | | | 52 | | | 46 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 37 | | | 48 | | | 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 | 53 | 61 | 59 | 52 | 54 | 52 | 51 | | | | | |
| SWD | 27 | 58 | 62 | 30 | 47 | 55 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | | | 55 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 59 | 60 | 53 | 56 | 54 | 52 | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 59 | 59 | 46 | 51 | 52 | 40 | | | | | |

| 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 | 53 | 42 | 25 | 47 | 55 | 50 | 40 | | | | | |
| SWD | 33 | | | 11 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 44 | 30 | 46 | 57 | 55 | 42 | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 35 | 10 | 42 | 49 | 45 | 38 | | | | | |

**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 | 58% | 57% | 1% | 54% | 4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 56% | -6% | 58% | -8% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 46% | -19% | 50% | -23% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 62% | -18% | 59% | -15% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 58% | 4% | 61% | 1% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 54% | 4% | 55% | 3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 49% | -9% | 51% | -11% |

## 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.**

Third grade ELA showed the lowest performance (71% scoring below Level 1 on FAST). We attribute this to needing to focus on strengthening the core in ELA using district adopted core Curriculum, McGraw Hill.

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

Third grade ELA showed the greatest decline from prior year (48% to 27%). The Third grade students from last year missed several weeks of foundational skills during their Kindergarten year. These students have directly been affected by the pandemic.

**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 had the greatest gap compared to the state average (27% Floral City compared to the State at 50%). The Third grade students last year missed several weeks of foundational skills during their Kindergarten year. These students have directly been affected by the pandemic.

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

Fifth grade Math showed the most improvement from 50% to 58%. The implementation of the new county adopted math curriculum, Savvas.

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

High absentee rate. We have created a goal to focus on reducing the number of absences.

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

1- Strengthen the core in ELA.
2- Daily, differentiated small groups in ELA and math
3- Reduce the number of absences within the top 52 students that missed the most days of school.

**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 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.

We have identified 52 students that had 10 or more unexcused absences the previous year. Our goal is to increase daily attendance for those students identified with 10 or more unexcused absences during the 22-23 school year.

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

Floral City Elementary will reduce the number of unexcused absences for the identified students by 20%.

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

Mr. Adams will monitor the identified student's attendance on a weekly basis through custom Skyward reports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Bart Adams (adamsb@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.)

Each student identified will be assigned a staff mentor that will check in on them on a daily/weekly basis. We will also invite the identified families for scheduled parenting classes. We are calling these classes 'Strategies for Student Success' to help reduce the negative connotation of parenting classes.

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

Over 70% of the 52 identified students scored below average on our PM3 assessments. By increasing the number of days those students are receiving direct instruction will result in students performing at a higher success rate for the 23-24 PM3 assessments.

**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.

1- Positive incentives of students and families
2- Family Outreach Plan- personal calls from the classroom teacher, frequent parent/teacher communication, home visit.
3- Family Outreach Program- Community partners and resources
4- Frequent data analysis
5- Student Success Strategies- Parenting classes that will focus on high yield strategies to help improve student achievement

6- Classroom based attendance incentives and rewards

7- Morning show messages

**Person Responsible:** Megan Furniss (furnissm@citrusschools.org)

**By When:** June 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.

Based upon our data review, increasing student proficiency levels and learning gains in math has been identified as critical area of focus for Floral City. On iReady, Our proficiency levels in Kindergarten and 3rd through 5th grade increased. On FAST , Math proficiency levels increased for grades 4th and 5th.However, our other grade levels proficiency decreased.

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

Student Math proficiency will increase by 10% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring tool.

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

FAST Progress Monitoring Tool
iReady
Teacher lessons plans
Walkthrough data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Megan Furniss (furnissm@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 math block which includes designated times for whole group instruction using evidence based Savaas curriculum to teach the BEST math standards, and differentiated small group instruction, and math interventions to address student deficit areas. Additionally, students will complete a minimum of 45 minutes of math iReady online instruction weekly.

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

These strategies were selected because the Savaas curriculum is research based and rigorous and has shown to be an effective program of instruction. The use of a structured math block which includes differentiated instruction 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.

1. Continue to instruct using BEST Math standards
2.Continue to use Savaas evidence-based math curriculum
3.Provide small group differentiated instruction
4.Continue to use iReady Math online instruction

5. Identify and refer to MTRs throughout instruction

6.Analyze data regularly during data days

**Person Responsible:** Megan Furniss (furnissm@citrusschools.org)

**By When:** June 2024

## #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

The Students with Disabilities subgroup's proficiency scores were below the federal index but have shown improvement when compared to data from 2021. Students with disabilities scored 22% proficient in 2021 and 44% proficient in 2022.

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

Floral City Elementary School will increase SWD student proficiency by 10% as measured by FAST progress monitoring tool.

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

FAST Progress Monitoring Tool
IReady
Teacher lesson plans
Walkthrough data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Donna Carone (caroned@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.)

Implement ELA and Math BEST standards, Wonders Reading curriculum, Savaas Math curriculum, small group specially designed instruction, IReady, Sonday System

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

Based on the results from our school strategic planning committee, we determined that these were the most effective interventions to put in place to increase the proficiency levels of our SWD students.

**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.

1. Use iReady online program for all students
2. Continue to implement Wonders reading and Savaas math curriculums
3. Implement evidence based structured phonics program K-2 (UFLI)
4. Analyze data frequently
5. Implement Sonday System and other approved curriculum to provide specially designed instruction for SWD students
6. ESE teachers and classroom teachers collaborate on best practices for SWD students

**Person Responsible:** Megan Furniss (furnissm@citrusschools.org)

**By When:** June 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).

Based on FAST assessment results show that we are below the 50th percentile in Kindergarten, Second, and Third grade Floral City allocated approximately 85% of our Title I budget towards personnel to assist in increasing student achievement. Our SAC has input on how our Title I funds funds are allocated. A percentage of our Title I funds are also allocated to include parent engagement activities such as Fall into a Good Book, Cookies with Santa, Orlando Science Center STEM Night, etc. Our SIP Committee also has input on the professional learning and funding allocated for professional learning.

## 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 has been identified as a critical area of focus. While some grade levels showed improvement from 2022 to 2023 according to iReady data, ELA continues to be an area in need of growth. When comparing our K-2 students' data from Fall 2022 to Spring 2023, we showed an increase in students on or above grade level. Kindergarten Fall 2022-Fall 24% at or above grade level/ Spring 2023 80% at or above grade level. 1st grade Fall 2022-15% at or above grade level/ Spring 2023 43% at or above grade level. 2nd grade Fall 2022-16% at or above grade level/ Spring 2023 53% at or above grade level. Despite the growth, we would like to see our proficiency levels increase.

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

Based on our data review, increasing student proficiency levels in ELA has been identified as a critical area of focus for grades 3-5. While some grade levels showed growth in proficiency according to iReady

diagnostic data, ELA continues to be an area of growth and focus. According to the data, 58% of our 5th graders were proficient, which was above the district and the state. 50% or our 4th graders and 27% of our 3rd graders were proficient. The need to continue with an ELA focus is evident.

**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

Student ELA proficiency will increase by 10% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring tool. PM3 Spring 2023: Kindergarten 43% at or above benchmark (Star Early Literacy), 1st grade 54% at or above benchmark (Star Reading), 2nd grade 52% at or above benchmark (Star Reading).

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Student ELA proficiency will increase by 10% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring tool. PM3 Spring 2023 FAST ELA: 3rd grade 27% proficient, 4th grade 50% proficient, 5th grade 58% proficient.

## 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
iReady
Data Days
Teacher lesson plans
Walkthrough data
Ongoing data analysis will allow us to identify areas of concern and implement appropriate instructional practices to guide lesson focus and differentiate instruction.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Furniss, Megan, furnissm@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?

Wonders ELA
iReady online instruction for Reading
UFLI Foundations phonics curriculum for K-2
BEST standards for Reading
EEs evident and utilized in classrooms
small group differentiated instruction
use of District Literacy Framework

**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 practices and programs above have proven effective in many districts throughout the state. 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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership<br>1. support for teachers from Literacy Committee<br>2. Teach Tuesday collaboration with grade levels on best practices.<br>Literacy Coaching<br>1. modeling from staff, administration, and district personnel<br>2. classroom support from staff, administration, and district personnel<br>Assessment<br>1. Data Days to review and analyze data<br>2. Sharing information from Walkthroughs with teachers<br>Professional Learning<br>1. "Comprehension Connections" book study<br>2. Training for K-2 on UFLI Foundations<br>3. Science of Reading training | Furniss, Megan, furnissm@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.

Our SIP is shared through our Student Advisory Council, posted on our school website, and a link to our SIP is printed in our school newsletter. We also provide the SIP in our parent newsletter along with a QR Code sent home with students for parents to access.

**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))

During the summer we invite parents and community members to come in a participate in Strategic Planning Meeting. This allows parents and community members to have input in our Parent Family engagement Plan and our areas of focus for the upcoming school year. We also require teachers to post lesson plans weekly to Family Access as well as weekly communication with parents.

**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))**

This year we moved several of our teachers in grades K-2 to help address concerns with the delivery of the core curriculum. We also adjusted the master schedule to maximize our K-2 ELA and Math learning blocks.

**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))**

Of our 200,000.00 Title I budget 85% of it goes towards personnel to help support Floral City.