

Orange County Public Schools

Citrus 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Citrus Elementary

87 N CLARKE RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, 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
Clark, Mary	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce school, district, and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Glover, Ashley	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; and other duties as assigned by the principal.
Jackson, Deborah	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach supports new teachers (those who are new to the profession as well as those who are experienced, yet new to the school). She provides instructional support to teachers through professional development in the form of workshops, planning, and coaching cycles. She assists teachers with reviewing data from common assessments to inform the next steps for instruction.
St. Onge, Daniel	Instructional Coach	Coaches will provide co-teaching and modeling to enhance teacher pedagogy, schedule peer observations, provide professional development for teachers based on needs and district and school initiatives, facilitate common planning, and coordinate and provide best practices for implementing digital tools. Subject area coaching will build capacity in math and science knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of math and science concern across the school. Coaches will initiate and sustain change efforts in math and science instruction at the school level by analyzing data and monitoring the progress of goals and objectives throughout the year.
Bangle, Ashley	ELL Compliance Specialist	<p>The ELL compliance specialist will conduct aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follow up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assess, evaluate, and monitor the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program, coordinate the reevaluation (extension of instruction) process of ESOL students and monitor the progress of ESOL students and former ESOL students on a 2-year monitoring plan. She will monitor students' ESOL records and keep them accurate, complete, and updated as required by law and district policy, work directly with the teachers to assist them with ESOL strategies accommodations, and interventions according to the ELL language proficiency levels in their classrooms, and work collaboratively with the ELL parents understanding the students' academic and linguistic progress.</p> <p>Additionally, she will serve as the MTSS coordinator. The MTSS coordinator will provide opportunities to build teachers' capacities in analyzing data and designing academic interventions. Through professional development opportunities, teachers will increase their knowledge of the MTSS process and instructional practices. The MTSS coach will monitor data on a weekly</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		basis and facilitate meetings with parents, teachers, and all applicable key stakeholders to analyze student data through the problem-solving process.
McDermitt, Mollie	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist is responsible for monitoring, implementing, gathering information from multiple sources and individuals to meet a set deadline along with adhering to set legal guidelines to ensure mandatory criteria and procedures have been met for students with disabilities. The Staffing Specialist collaborates with School Psychologist, Social Worker, ESE teacher, Behavior Coach, District Staffing Specialist, Program Specialist, and District Attorney to ensure adherence to federal and county guidelines. She will support teachers and parents with student needs. She will input meeting outcome data into multiple systems of accountability. She will adhere to timelines when initiating, implementing and following up on meetings. She is responsible for IEP creation, adaptation, implementation and compliance verification in grades preK-5. She will attend M.T.S.S meetings and data collection/analyzing to assist with the progression of student support.
Stodolak, Cindy	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides support to all students and staff through teaching lessons in the classroom, promoting character education, and hosting small groups for specific needs, in order to increase student resiliency.

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.

Stakeholders were involved in the creation of this document by reviewing data from the 2022-23 school year. Input for strategies to best meet the needs of students and build capacity within teachers was provided and has been included in this document.

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))

Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted across all grade levels to ensure benchmark-aligned teaching occurs across all content areas daily. Actionable feedback will be provided and monitoring for implementation will occur. Progress monitoring data will be collected and reviewed during weekly PLC meetings, and instructional shifts will be made based on this data. The instructional leadership team will meet weekly to review progress and adjustments will be made based on data analysis and coaching notes.

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	86%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	1	13	17	11	7	12	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	4	3	8	0	0	0	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	5	14	15	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	17	27	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	27	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	9	14	14	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	3	5	16	19	0	0	0	45

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	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	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	2	24	14	13	14	9	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	27	0	0	0	49
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	

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	0	1	1	4	13	19	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	24	14	13	14	9	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	27	0	0	0	49
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

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	0	1	1	4	13	19	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	51	57	53	55	56	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				73			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			41		
Math Achievement*	49	60	59	54	46	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				63			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			26		
Science Achievement*	52	63	54	53	61	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	57			37		

* 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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	262
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	20	Yes	4	2
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	49			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	49			

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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	57			
HSP	54			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	51			49			52					53
SWD	25			14							2	
ELL	41			46			53				5	53
AMI												
ASN	58			74							2	
BLK	49			42			41				5	53
HSP	56			54			59				5	56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57			61							3	
FRL	45			46			47				5	57

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	55	73	65	54	63	45	53					57
SWD	7	50	58	19	44		8					
ELL	46	70	71	54	66	43	40					57
AMI												
ASN	68	91		79	73							

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
BLK	50	74	73	49	60	52	43					58
HSP	50	66	55	59	67	25	53					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	67		54	56		70					
FRL	45	69	65	44	60	53	43					48

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	39	43	41	40	34	26	39					37
SWD	8			8								
ELL	25	33		38	36		7					37
AMI												
ASN	69			75								
BLK	35	39	29	37	33	13	39					35
HSP	24	31		27	8		38					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	61		53	47		39					
FRL	34	48	50	35	35	31	30					30

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	46%	54%	-8%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	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.

Citrus Elementary's overall Math and Science proficiency were both 50% and ELA was 51%. When looking at our subgroup data, SWD's overall math proficiency was 10%, science proficiency 11%, and 21% in ELA. There has been an increase in proficiency rates for SWD compared to previous data, though the rates are still below district and state averages. A contributing factor affecting the performance of students with disabilities is a lack of foundational skills in both reading and math. This deficiency in foundational skills is negatively impacting students' ability to understand text and solve complex math problems.

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

Overall proficiency in English Language Arts, Science, and Math has declined when comparing the data from 2022 to the current year. The decline is specifically as follows: ELA and Science proficiency decreased by one percentage point each, while Math proficiency decreased by two percentage points. One of the contributing factors to this decline is the adoption of new state standards in ELA and Math. These new standards brought about changes in curriculum and expectations for what students should learn at each grade level. As a result of this adoption, students faced challenges in adjusting to the new content and requirements. The adoption of new standards in Math led to knowledge gaps in mathematical concepts. Changes in the curriculum introduced unfamiliar and more advanced topics that students were not adequately prepared for. As a consequence, many students struggled to develop the

necessary conceptual understanding needed to excel in their grade-level math tasks. Shifts in the standards initially resulted in transitional difficulties as both teachers and students adapted to the new expectations.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the SWD in all subject areas. One factor that contributed to this gap is a lack of foundational skills. Proficiency in phonics and vocabulary directly affects a student's ability to understand and comprehend both literary and informational texts. If students can't decode words properly or lack the necessary vocabulary, they will struggle to grasp the meaning of what they're reading. This greatly impacts students' abilities to comprehend literary and informational texts. English Language Arts skills are foundational for success in many other subjects, including science. Science texts often contain complex terminology and concepts, which can be difficult to understand if a student's reading and language skills are not at the appropriate level.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Hispanic students' ELA proficiency data, which increased from 50% in 2022 to 55% in 2023. This increase in ELA achievement was a result of providing additional support within the general education classroom. Instead of pulling students out for interventions, support staff came into the classroom to assist. This approach allowed students to stay integrated with their peers and ensured that they received support while participating in regular classroom activities. Regular collaboration between interventionists and general education teachers occurred during monthly planning meetings allowing teachers to ensure that the strategies and support provided were consistent across the grade level.

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

One area of concern is level 1 performance in ELA. Another area of concern is the level 1 performance in Math and Science.

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

Focusing on improving education and student outcomes, particularly for students with disabilities, will be our top priority for the 2023-24 school year.

Increasing proficiency for all learners will be a priority.

Improving student attendance is also an area of focus for this year.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

According to 2022-23 FAST ELA data, 21% of ESSA subgroup SWD demonstrated proficiency, compared to 51% overall proficiency. There is a great need for improvement with our Students with Disabilities (SWD). This ESSA subgroup has consistently been below the 41% ESSA threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of SWD will show an increase of at least one level on the ELA FAST from 2023 PM3 to 2024 PM3.
50% of SWD will show an increase of at least one level on the math FAST from 2023 PM3 to 2024 PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Biweekly meetings with the staffing specialist, MTSS coach, and SLD teacher will be held to discuss progress on IEP goals, upcoming ESE meetings, documented accommodations, etc., and make adjustments as necessary based on the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

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.)

We will increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports in small group instruction while implementing the use of flexible grouping. This will be monitored by daily classroom walkthroughs with timely actionable feedback, as well as progress monitoring of groups. We will track student progress within groups and ensure groupings remain fluid to accommodate the changing needs of students. Interventions in phonemic awareness and phonics will be provided using Heggerty and SIPPS to increase students' ability to decode text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction helps to differentiate and scaffold instruction in ways that meet individual student needs. Teachers will receive support in implementing these strategies and accommodations effectively. Through the support of the SLD teacher, classroom teacher, and grade-level interventionists students will receive multiple layers of individualized support.

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.

Meet with the staffing specialist, MTSS coach, and SLD teacher bi-weekly to discuss SWD data, review IEPs and accommodations, and create action steps to address student needs.

Person Responsible: Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

By When: Biweekly meetings will begin in September 2023 and continue through May 2024.

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

Person Responsible: Mollie McDermit (mollie.mcdermit@ocps.net)

By When: Planning will begin in September 2023 and continue through May 2024.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 2023 FAST data, 51% of students were proficient in ELA and 50% of students were proficient in math and science. Student achievement will increase as a result of building teacher capacity in weekly data-driven PLCs, rigorous standards-based instruction in all classrooms, and the use of literacy strategies across all content areas. Consistent collaboration between teachers, coaches, and administration will build teacher capacity and understanding of content standards, instructional strategies, and the needs of individual students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall student achievement in ELA will increase from 51% to 61%.

Overall student achievement in math will increase from 50% to 60%.

Overall student achievement in science will increase from 50% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership will be present and active in all PLCs to ensure collaboration focuses on standards-aligned instruction and high-yield instructional strategies. PLC agendas and notes will be used to document conversations and instructional decisions. Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine if additional strategies need to be implemented.

Leadership will develop and implement a classroom walkthrough schedule for all grade levels. During walkthroughs specified "look-fors" will be observed and immediate actionable feedback will be given. During these walkthroughs, leadership will monitor the implementation of strategies discussed during grade-level

PLCs. Based on walkthrough data, teachers will be "tiered" and coaching cycles will be implemented based on individual teacher needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

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.)

The leadership team will build up our system of how we analyze data and instructional practices, to make necessary adjustments to standards-aligned instruction that improves student achievement outcomes. Through weekly, data-driven professional learning communities (PLCs) teachers will have the opportunity to analyze data and instructional practices, as well as use data to determine remediation and enrichment needs to improve student achievement outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through ongoing analysis of data and instructional practices, we will be able to accommodate the needs of all of the diverse learners at Citrus Elementary School. Data will be used to tier students and teachers. Support will be given to both students and teachers based on individual needs. We will use ongoing progress monitoring of individual student data to drive the MTSS process and ensure necessary interventions are in place.

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.

Meet weekly in PLCs to support teachers with content and high-yield instructional strategies. Incorporate data analysis in PLCs to drive instructional shifts.

Person Responsible: Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Content coaches will provide ongoing professional development on processing, monitoring, and engagement strategies, as well as content standards. The leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs to gather trends on the implementation of the learning during PLCs and PDs. Data from classroom walkthroughs will inform professional development throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Deborah Jackson (deborah.jackson@ocps.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

#3. 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 will continue to work on strengthening student resiliency, character education, and life skills instruction during the weekly scheduled health period. Based on early warning indicators, our students with disabilities demonstrated a significant achievement gap in all core content areas and may require additional support in the area of student resiliency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on discipline data from the 2022-23 school year, 46 students received referrals throughout the year, totaling 100 referrals. As a result of the implementation of the Second Step curriculum, referrals will be reduced to 35 students totaling no more than 85 referrals.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the number of discipline referrals that are completed at school weekly. As students gain skills to improve social skills and understand the impact they have on the feelings of others, the number of referrals will be reduced.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Glover (ashley.glover@ocps.net)

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.)

This school year we will increase the delivery of lessons focused on empathy and resiliency as well as problem-solving skills in all grade levels through the use of the Second Steps curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

After reviewing our referral data, it is evident that this is an area for improvement. The four highest behavior infractions for the 2022-23 school year are as follows: Physical Altercations (10), Simple Battery (11), Serious Misconduct (18), and Other Misconduct (19). Because the Second Step curriculum focuses on the following goals: gaining confidence, goal setting, making better decisions, collaborating with others in work and play, and navigating the world more effectively, students will be more prepared when navigating social interactions.

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.

Use the evidence-based Second Step curriculum weekly during the scheduled health block.

Person Responsible: Cindy Stodolak (cindy.stodolak@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Teachers will attend professional development focused on mental health first aid.

Person Responsible: Cindy Stodolak (cindy.stodolak@ocps.net)

By When: May 30, 2023

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 School Advisory Committee reviews the SIP and SIP updates. Once the review is complete the SAC makes decisions based on data reviews for the best ways to utilize funding. Approved resources are presented to the SAC along with research on how the program meets the needs of students before the SAC makes a final decision.

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

To increase reading proficiency in grades K-2, Citrus Elementary School will build students' academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge. Students will develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Ensuring each student reads connected text daily will support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

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

To increase reading proficiency in grades 3-5, Citrus Elementary School will build students' decoding skills to read complex multisyllabic words. Students will be provided with purposeful fluency-building activities to increase effortless reading. Teachers will routinely use comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

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

Students in grades K-2 will increase their reading proficiency from an average of 71% to an average of 81%, as measured by the STAR Reading Progress Monitoring Three assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in grades 3-5 will increase their reading proficiency from an average of 51% to an average of 61%, as measured by the FAST Reading Progress Monitoring Three assessment.

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.

Weekly reading walkthroughs will be completed by school administrators.

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Clark, Mary, mary.clark@ocps.net

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?

Students will have opportunities to practice foundational skills daily, where they will learn to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Comprehension skills will be included in connected text to help students make sense of the text. The use of Heggery will develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Our SIPPS program teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words, as well as build students' decoding skills so they can read complete multisyllabic words. The district adopted the Being a Reader small group curriculum to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. The use of Multisensory Kits supports developing awareness of the segments and sounds in speech and how they link to letters. The digital platform, Exact Path, teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This program also supports student comprehension through the routine use of a set of comprehension-building practices to support students in making sense of the text.

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 rationale for selecting these practices includes a district selection to ensure students are being taught foundational skills in reading instruction daily. These practices address all components of reading to begin closing achievement gaps.

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
<p>Monthly literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps are implemented and monitored.</p>	<p>Clark, Mary, mary.clark@ocps.net</p>
<p>Our literacy coach attends district coach meetings. She uses data to identify personnel and areas of need and implements coaching cycles, modeling, and PLC planning support to fit the areas of need. The literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.</p>	<p>Jackson, Deborah, deborah.jackson@ocps.net</p>
<p>Assessments will be used and analyzed: FAST Heggerty Assessments District Created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grade 2) DIBELS (Grades K-1) Being a Reader Formative Data (Grades K-3) SIPPS Formative Data (Grades K-5)</p> <p>Use of all assessment data, formal and informal, will determine interventions and support the needs of students.</p>	<p>Clark, Mary, mary.clark@ocps.net</p>
<p>Citrus Elementary School develops professional learning based on the needs of the school. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options are available that include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD, and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction.</p>	<p>Clark, Mary, mary.clark@ocps.net</p>

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 SIP will be shared and reviewed during monthly SAC meetings, and input will be received during these meetings as well. Our SIP goals and updates will also be reviewed during our monthly Parent Engagement Nights. The SIP is also available on the school's website found here:
<https://citrus.ocps.net/>

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))

Positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders are being built through monthly Parent and Family Engagement Nights. The morning announcements are made available to families and community members to support the needs of students and keep families and community members up to date with what is going on in the school. Stakeholders are encouraged to volunteer at the school to increase participation in the education of our students. The Family Engagement Plan is made public through our school website here: <https://citrus.es.cops.net/>.

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)

Academic programs will be strengthened by creating fluid groups of students who receive differentiated instruction in all core content areas daily. Additionally, students are strategically selected to attend tutoring where we follow an acceleration model. The amount and quality of learning time will be monitored through daily walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided. Instruction will be monitored to determine additional coaching support to ensure an accelerated curriculum. SWD will be identified with progress monitoring reviewed biweekly during ESE team meetings. Action plans will be created and action steps monitored to ensure student needs are being met.

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))

Citrus Elementary School will implement district and state-approved curricula during the traditional school day and during tutoring opportunities.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No