

Citrus County Schools

# Citrus Springs Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Citrus Springs Elementary School

3570 W CENTURY BLVD, Citrus Springs, FL 34433

<https://cse.citrusschools.org/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Sharen Lowe**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Citrus County School Board.

## **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

We, the students, staff, parents, and community members of Citrus Springs Elementary School will provide a learner-centered environment where students are given a well-rounded foundation of knowledge on a safe campus. By working together, our students will become literate, productive and successful citizens of a global community. We will strive to maintain each child's right to learn through appropriate learning experiences, sound discipline policies and a respect for self and others. We pledge to communicate to parents and involve them in this process.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Citrus Springs Elementary School is a learning community where children are valued, nurtured, and are given the opportunity to reach their full potential.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Grassman, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor	Counseling
Jackson, Joan	Other	ESE Staffing Specialist
Vonderhaar, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Lowe, Sharen	Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Sharen Lowe

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

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

39

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	130	118	101	115	125	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	8	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	6	5	7	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	8	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	12	10	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Thursday 7/16/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	114	98	107	122	116	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685
Attendance below 90 percent	3	17	17	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	9	9	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	4	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	114	98	107	122	116	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685
Attendance below 90 percent	3	17	17	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	9	9	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	4	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	59%	57%	60%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	59%	50%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	53%	53%	41%	48%
Math Achievement	59%	60%	63%	66%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains	61%	54%	62%	57%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	39%	51%	50%	39%	47%
Science Achievement	73%	60%	53%	73%	61%	55%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
	2018	69%	55%	14%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
	2018	60%	67%	-7%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	71%	58%	13%	53%	18%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	26	29	23	26	32	35	25				
ELL	40			60							
BLK	56	40		33							
HSP	48	39		50	57	40	91				
MUL	53	36		53	64						
WHT	61	65	55	62	63	50	73				
FRL	51	54	46	55	57	40	73				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	28	38	39	34	48	37	46				
BLK	53	69		53	62						
HSP	56	64	45	54	44	40	60				
MUL	73			73							
WHT	60	57	55	68	58	54	75				
FRL	54	60	54	61	57	51	70				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
-----------------------------	--

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math Achievement in the Lowest Quartile: Tier II and Tier III math interventions have been inconsistently implemented and a lack of professional development specifically in the content area of math appear to have contributed to the decline.

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

Math achievement overall decreased by 7 percentage points. A lack of interventions and professional development in the area of math appear to have contributed to the decline.

#### **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**

Math learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile shows a 6% gap when compared to the state. Tier II and Tier III math interventions have been inconsistently implemented and a

lack of professional development specifically in the content area of math appear to have contributed to the decline.

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

Math learning gains overall showed the most improvement. This success is attributed to our tutoring program, progress monitoring, data chats, team planning, and standards-based assessments.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Attendance appears to be directly linked to a student having additional risk factors on the EWS.

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

1. SWD Learning Gains
2. K-5 Math Achievement
3. K-5 Reading Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus** Students with Disabilities Learning Gains  
**Description** 29% of SWD showed learning gains in ELA  
 32% of SWD showing learning gains in Math  
**Rationale:**

**Measureable Outcome:** 45% of SWD will making learning gains in ELA  
 55% of SWD will make learning gains in Math

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Joan Jackson (jacksonj1@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** iReady Diagnostic and online instruction, the use of Ready Florida LAFS and MAFS curriculum for standards-based instruction, frequent progress monitoring and data tracking, professional development for inclusive learning strategies, reduced teacher to SWD ratio

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The iReady diagnostic is adaptive and will lead to targeted online instruction for every student. Resources for intervention are also available through iReady and will be used to strengthen the interventions for SWD.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide professional development relative to teaching students with disabilities in inclusive settings.
2. Create a schedule that allows for a reduction in the ratio of SWD and teachers.
3. Administer and analyze the results of the iReady BOY diagnostic test.
4. Develop interventions using the iReady Toolbox.
5. Frequently monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.
6. Create Reading and Math Interventionist/Instructional Support positions to support classroom instruction and data monitoring.

**Person Responsible** Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

47% of all students in grades K-5 scored "on grade level" in reading comprehension as measured by iReady  
 39% of all students in grades K-5 scored "on grade level" in the math strand of Numbers and Operations as measured by iReady

**Measureable Outcome:**

60% of all students in grades K-5 will score "on grade level" in reading comprehension as measured by iReady  
 50% of all students in grades K-5 will score "on grade level" in the math strand of Numbers and Operations as measured by iReady

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Systematic instructional coaching in reading and math will be implemented through the use of a K-2 Instructional Coach, a 3-5 ELA Instructional Support Interventionist, and a 3-5 Math Instructional Support Interventionist.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Each instructional support position will closely monitor student progress in their respective area and provide instructional coaching support and interventions for students.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Create an instructional coaching model in grades K-2 with an Instructional Coach.
2. Create a Reading Instructional Support Interventionist position to support classroom instruction and data monitoring for grades 3-5.
3. Create a Math Instructional Support Interventionist position to support classroom instruction and data monitoring for grades 3-5.
4. Provide structured collaborative planning times that occur a minimum of twice monthly.
5. Monitor iReady student performance on a weekly basis and meet with teachers for data discussions.

**Person Responsible**

Sharen Lowe (lowes@citruschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Social Emotional Health as it relates to behavior is a concern area. Positive behavior supports, a Behavior TOSA, a full time social worker, the implementation of Second Step and Sanford Harmony, and social skills groups are all being used to address the concern.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Each year we create opportunities for community and family involvement such as iReady Family Night, Night at the Museum, Literacy Night, etc.. These events are designed to build relationship with families and other stakeholders and garner their interest in our curriculum and academic expectations. We also continuously update stakeholders about our curriculum progress through monthly newsletters, information posted on Twitter and our school website. We also keep families abreast of curriculum expectations and events throughout the year, by utilizing weekly classroom newsletters. Additionally, to support positive behavior, our staff will work as a team to address the social emotional needs of our students. We will continue to use the Sanford Harmony program which focuses on improving the social emotional health of our school. We will also utilize a school wide behavior plan to help create clarity and consistence for staff and students. Our guidance counselor and administrative team will continue to make positive phone calls home when students receive a positive referral or one of our many other positive behavior recognition awards, such as Hawk Leader.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.