Citrus Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Citrus Elementary School

2771 CITRUS PL, Vero Beach, FL 32968

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Tosha Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River 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.

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.

The mission of Citrus Elementary: We are guiding today's children to BEEcome tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate and engage all learners for college or career readiness and to empower them to be proficient, independent, critical thinkers.

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
Garcia, Kimberly	Principal	
Rahal, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Hoover, Laurie	Administrative Support	ESE Resource Specialist
Carlsen, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Literacy
Keeler, Jen	Instructional Coach	Math
Savoie-Guerra, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	K-3 Interventionist
Del Tufo, Amber	Instructional Coach	Math
Mejia, Kelli	Instructional Coach	Literacy

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/21/2017, Tosha Jones

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.*
4

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.*
76

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
58

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	81	113	124	124	124	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	678
Attendance below 90 percent	2	20	18	13	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	9	4	3	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/21/2020

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	112	116	127	114	120	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	3	19	16	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	2	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	112	116	127	114	120	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	3	19	16	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	2	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	52%	58%	57%	45%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	57%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	53%	38%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	58%	63%	63%	51%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	60%	62%	48%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	23%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	54%	53%	39%	48%	51%

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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	64%	-8%	62%	-6%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	64%	-6%	64%	-6%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	61%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	44	52	27	51	54	33				
ELL	39	58	61	49	66	64	17				
BLK	36	53	59	42	63	50	28				
HSP	45	56	55	61	67	67	33				
MUL	47	70		29							
WHT	62	65	71	64	61	62	64				
FRL	47	57	59	55	66	61	47				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	37	37	32	51	41	4				
ELL	22	42		49	58	40					
BLK	26	45	47	30	48	41	15				
HSP	39	47	57	46	54	36	33				
MUL	41	46		47	38						
WHT	58	57	52	62	62	41	45				
FRL	44	49	46	48	54	38	34				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	30	31	21	33	25	10				
ELL	38	55		56	48						
BLK	30	45	36	32	41	25	17				
HSP	43	51	46	54	47		27				
MUL	33			33	30						
WHT	52	47	35	56	52	23	45				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	40	42	36	47	46	26	30				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
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
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
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	64
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	56
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.

Data from FSA 2019: Students with disabilities showed a low proficiency rate both in ELA and in Math (21 and 27% respectively). While the proficiency was not high, our learning gains increased from 37% to 52% in ELA and 41% to 54% in math. Our goal this year will be to increase proficiency levels, and

have it at 60% for math, ELA and Science for all students in Grades 3-5.

Data from 2019-2020 school year: In our walk throughs, last year, differentiation of Tier one instruction, was the least evident in all our observations (with no more than 15% evident), as well as a lack of accountable talk being evident (with 21% as of March). While PD was offered in Accountable Talk, differentiation was not a focus for the 2019-2020 school year.

ELA proficiency was at 52%
Science was at 49%
Math proficiency was at 58%
Due to our proficiency not being at the goal of 60% in all subject areas, we need to implement strategies in differentiation and accountable talk to increase our proficiency scores.

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

Fourth grade proficiency showed the greatest decline in ELA with the lowest proficiency level in all grades. Their ELA proficiency level in 2019, as third graders was 45%, but per the Unit assessments, their predicted proficiency was still less than 50% (at 49%).

Fourth grade proficiency showed the greatest decline in math with the lowest proficiency level in all grades. Their Math proficiency level in 2019, as third graders was 56%, but per the Unit assessments, their predicted proficiency decreased to 54%.

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.

Data from 2019-2020 SIP PLAN: The areas that we are below the state average include: science achievement where our numbers are at 49%, while the state is 53%, ELA at 52% while state average is 57% and Math at 58% while state average is 63%. The factor that contributes most to this is the lack of strong Tier One Instruction. While we increased in all areas, the were several things that were added, and will continue in the 2020-2021 school year. We added a school wide rTi model, designed the master schedule to delineate between small group and whole group instruction, designated science times in the schedule and monthly full days of science experiments. All of these things were created to strengthen our Core curriculum. This past year, we have added a specials rotation of science to help us increase our proficiency rate, and our media center has a concentration on science using non fiction literature. The science coach will also be working with 5th grade students who are proficient in ELA during a 9:00-9:30 block daily, and small groups of students (10 max) multiple days a week, and the math and ELA coaches will be working with their teachers to facilitate differentiation, as well other topics to increase the pedagogy in Tier 1.

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

The bottom quartile in ELA and Math proficiency showed the most improvement from 2018-2019.
Over the past three years, we went from 38-62% in ELA bottom quartile gains, 47-60% in ELA Learning Gains, and 45-52% in proficiency.
We will continue to strive to make the gains that we have over the past three years: from 23-59% in Math bottom quartile gains, 48-64% in Math Learning Gains, and 51-58% in proficiency.
Our data meetings for Unit Assessments, and Tier 2 chats, focused largely on our bottom quartile and what steps we were taking to help these students make gains while implementing instructional strategies to reach proficiency levels.
In science, our proficiency scores over the past three years went from 39-49%.
Our data meetings for Unit Assessments, and Tier 1 chats, focused largely on our bubble students

who are close to proficiency and what steps we were taking to help these students make gains, and hopefully become proficient.

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

Attendance (last year we were 1% point away from our goal of 95% or more)

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Culture and Climate
4. School Wide Theme-Community Citizenship

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using ELA data to drive instruction, the core instruction program is aligned to FL ELA standards through weekly grade level meetings, PD, monthly data meetings, and quarterly collaborative ELA planning. ELA Pacing guides are utilized to align standards-based instruction, reteach and fidelity of reading instruction. The weekly meetings with coaches present will have a focus on differentiation in the weekly lesson plans (centers for one half of the year, and small group and centers for the second half of the year or vice versa), based on formative assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, our goal for differentiation, as observed through walk-throughs with leadership team school wide twice every nine weeks: 1st nine weeks: 50% evident 2nd nine weeks: 60% evident 3rd nine weeks: 75% evident 4th nine weeks: 90% evident It will also be observed with a predicted proficiency rate, using unit assessments of at least 60%, reviewed individually monthly, and collectively quarterly
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Citrus Elementary Tier 1 Reading instruction will include differentiation using the core curriculum mandated by the district. Differentiation will be intentionally developed during planning (as will accountable talk during whole group). Using Carol Ann Tomlinson, How to Differentiate Instruction in Academically Diverse Classrooms, as our guide, PD will be provided, weekly planning with coaches with specific times for questioning to accommodate differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Multiple studies have demonstrated the impact of using data to drive instruction, while differentiating in a multitiered approach (Gersten et al, 2008; Tomlinson et al., 2003). Currently, differentiation is almost non-evident as indicated by our school wide walkthroughs. Increase in scores for unit assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, and FSA in the intermediate grades will be evidence of this and data will be collected during leadership walk-throughs.

Action Steps to Implement

Hold initial data meeting to review previous year's data and BOY i-Ready data, and then have a data meeting after each unit test or diagnostic to drive instruction for all students. Data meetings will also include 2-3 times expected goals for predicted proficiency and learning gains for all students, reviewing Unit assessments, FSA, i-Ready and formative assessments.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development as needed based on scores, walkthroughs, impact reviews (i.e. Accountable Talk, Differentiation).

Person Responsible	Tiffany Carlsen (tiffany.carlsen@indianriverschools.org)

Oversee weekly standards planning with academic coaches and/or admin

Person Responsible	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Implement coaching cycle for all ELA teachers, using the two academic ELA coaches to help with differentiation or anything else to increase pedagogy of all teachers throughout the year

Person Responsible Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Initiate Tier 2 instruction for all students to remediate, practice or enrich, based on data (movement happens after Tier 2 meetings once every 6-8 weeks for the year).

Person Responsible Kelli Mejia (kelli.mejia@indianriverschools.org)

Create quarterly 4-hour collaborative planning with the teachers and coaches to bridge the gap and try to help each student find success, with success not being defined the same for each child.

Person Responsible Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Implement student conferences to hold all accountable for academic growth and achievement throughout the year (ex. goal setting for unit tests, checklists for units passed in i-Ready, etc.).

Person Responsible Kelli Mejia (kelli.mejia@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct walkthroughs to ensure the fidelity of standard based instruction using differentiation

Person Responsible Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data-driven differentiated and multi-tiered Math instruction Using Math data to drive instruction, the core instruction program is aligned to FL Math standards through weekly grade level meetings, PD, monthly data meetings, and quarterly collaborative planning. Math pacing guides are utilized to align standards-based instruction, reteach and fidelity of instruction. The weekly meetings with coaches present will have a focus on the weekly lesson plans and differentiation for centers for the first half of the year, and small group and centers for the second half of the year, based on formative assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, our goal for differentiation, as observed through walk throughs with leadership team school wide twice every nine weeks: 1st nine weeks: 50% evident 2nd nine weeks: 60% evident 3rd nine weeks: 75% evident 4th nine weeks: 90% evident It will also be observed with a predicted proficiency rate, using unit assessments of at least 60%, reviewed individually monthly, and collectively quarterly
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Citrus Elementary Tier 1 Math instruction will include differentiation using the core Math curriculum mandated by the district. Differentiation will be intentionally developed during planning (as will accountable talk). Using Carol Ann Tomlinson, How to Differentiate Instruction in Academically Diverse Classrooms, as our guide, PD will be provided, weekly planning with coaches with specific times for questioning to accommodate differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Multiple studies have demonstrated the impact of using data to drive instruction, while differentiating in a multitiered approach (Gersten et al, 2009; Tomlinson et al., 2003). Currently, differentiation is almost non-evident as indicated by our school wide walkthroughs. Increase in scores for unit assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, and FSA in the intermediate grades will be evidence of this and data will be collected during leadership walk-throughs.

Action Steps to Implement	
Hold initial data meeting and then after each unit test or diagnostic to drive differentiated instruction.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)
Provide professional development, with a focus on differentiation.	
Person Responsible	Amber Del Tufo (amber.deltufo@indianriverschools.org)
Implement coaching cycle with all teachers, using academic coaches in Math (Knight, 2011).	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)
Oversee weekly standards planning with academic coaches (Knight, 2011).	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)

Create quarterly 4-hour collaborative planning (focusing on differentiation) with the teachers and coaches to bridge the gap and try to help each student find success, with success not being defined the same for each child.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)

Implement individual student conferences to hold accountable for academic growth and achievement throughout the year.

Person Responsible   Jen Keeler (jen.keeler@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct walkthroughs to ensure the fidelity of standards based instruction using differentiation.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Multiple studies have shown that a positive school culture and climate impact student achievement (Fitzgerald, Geraci, & Swanson, 2014: Kocyigit, 2017; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Raappana, 2014). Recent 2019-2020 student referrals (March 11) decreased from 72-67, which suggests a positive trend, however far above our goal of 60 ODR's per year.
Measurable Outcome:	Quantitative data will be collected. Our goal is a 10% decrease in ODR's with 60 at the same time next year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Multiple positive culture and climate strategies will continue to be implemented for children and staff. These include various celebrations (weekly, monthly and quarterly), school wide celebrations, PBS store, Awesome Gram calls home (to name a few). Staff celebrations include: reverse bee bucks, Whoop Whoop Wagon, Thanks for Being You Awards, and attendance awards, etc. (Fitzgerald, Geraci, & Swanson, 2014; Raappana, 2014). If students and staff are happy and being recognized and rewarded for hard work, they will come to school, ready to learn. Positive Behavior Intervention System is used school wide. We have monthly meetings to discuss the data related to decrease in referrals, attendance, positive rewards, and consequences that the whole school buys into (Eyler, 2014; Netzel & Eber, 2003).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive culture and climate strategies, as well as school wide PBIS, have shown to support student learning (Eyler, 2014; Fitzgerald, Geraci, & Swanson, 2014; Kocyigit, 2017; Mac Neil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Netzel & Eber, 2003; Raappana, 2014). PBIS has shown a decrease in our number of referrals over the past three years, and based on this year's data we became a bronze level PBIS Model school.

Action Steps to Implement

Created a beginning of the year PBS rules/procedures video using students to model expected behavior due to COVID. (Normally, students rotate through centers to learn school wide expectations.)

Person Responsible	Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

Create a weekly newsletter for staff with shout outs and positive quotes

Person Responsible	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct weekly calls home to parents for Bee Awesome Grams

Person Responsible	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)

Generate bee bucks to be given to staff and Dojo to students to be used at a student PBS store (or for other rewards like Principal for the Day) and for the staff raffle

Person Responsible	Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

Establish positive reinforcement activities for students (Lunch in the Courtyard, celebrations for efforts in school, etc.)

Person Responsible Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Lead a mentoring students, using 40+ staff to decrease negative behavior or outbursts.

Person Responsible Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

Execute Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBiS)school wide and we have monthly meetings to discuss the data related to decrease in referrals, attendance, positive rewards, and consequences that the whole school buys into. This research-based program has shown a decrease in out number of referrals over the past two years.

Person Responsible Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to school theme	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Citrus is a a school of community citizenship. Community and parental involvement have been shown to support student achievement in all students, and more specifically on diverse population of students including students with exceptionalities and low socioeconomic status (Haines et al, 2015). To increase community involvement, multiple strategies and actions will be implemented at our school.
Measurable Outcome:	Quantitative data will be collected regarding the number of partnerships, projects, and programs implemented at our school. Qualitative data will be collected using a student satisfaction survey. If students are more community based, and they are more engaged in school, the student satisfaction survey results for pre and post should show a positive increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	As COVID subsides, partnerships will be established with various community outreach programs and grade-level based service projects. Interdisciplinary, intergrade community clubs including service learning will be implemented to build empathy and cooperation amongst our students (Warren, 2012).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Community engagement and service learning have been shown to support student learning (Haines et al, 2016; Warren, 2012). Parental and community involvement have been identified as a pillar to improve students' literacy skills (Nai-Cheng, 2016), and increase socioemotional student efficacy.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a student satisfaction survey at the beginning of the year and end of year to see how our students feel connected to our school as a community.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org)

Develop community outreach projects once a semester, with organizations such as: Hope for Families, and other charitable organizations (Nai-Cheng, 2016).

Person Responsible	Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org)

Expand on existing programs, such as Audubon and ELC, Unify, Stinger Singers, after-school programs, etc. (Haines et al., 2016), which will be shown in number of participants this year, prior to last year.

Person Responsible	Valerie Savoie-Guerra (valerie.savoieguerra@indianriverschools.org)

Implement mentoring program by staff and students.

Person Responsible	Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

Create a mentorship program with counselor for Grade 5 students to mentor 1st graders.

Person Responsible	Rachel Swallow (rachel.swallow@indianriverschools.org)

Create a student government who will be meeting monthly.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org) |

Grade 5 doing research choice projects that will impact our community or a service occupation (Teacher, law enforcement, etc.) once a semester.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Rahal (kimberly.rahal@indianriverschools.org) |

As COVID subsides:
-integrate student and service learning opportunities with field trips to organizations, such as: Harbor Branch, Vero Beach Museum of Art, Halo Humane Society, Piper, FPL, first responders program (Haines et al., 2016; Warren, 2012).
- expand on existing community mentor program (Nai-Cheng, 2016).
- implement an intergrade level Genius Hour community clubs within the school.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Garcia (kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance has changed this year with the pandemic, and thus we need to be cognizant of reasons students are out of school. There is a process in place for teachers to call home if a student is absent for more than 3 consecutive days (this will resume after COVID), and then next step is for administration to call. At 10 absences, a note from the school is sent home. If the absences continue, the district attendance officer is contacted to created and attendance contract with the family involved.

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.

Citrus Elementary has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$65,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0141 - Citrus Elementary School			$22,000.00
			Notes: Salaries for teachers who will have after-school or before school tutoring, remediating or enrichment this is for Area of Focus 1 and 2			
	5100	510-Supplies	0141 - Citrus Elementary School			$25,000.00
			Notes: Materials needed to differentiate instruction in math and ELA			
	5100	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0141 - Citrus Elementary School			$10,000.00
			Notes: Buses for Extended Learning Opportunities			
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0141 - Citrus Elementary School			$8,000.00
			Notes: Substitutes needed for Collaborative Planning and PDs			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				$6,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0141 - Citrus Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,500.00
			Notes: Books for all students at the Holidays			
	9800		0141 - Citrus Elementary School	Other		$5,000.00
			Notes: Internal-Principal Discretionary Funds: Rewards for both students and staff Internal-Principal Discretionary Funds: Staff benefit and recognition (ex. staff breakfasts, etc) Internal Accounts: Rewards for students, using PBS Bee Bucks (ex. PBS Store, Ices at lunch in the courtyard, etc.)			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: school theme				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0141 - Citrus Elementary School			$5,000.00
			Notes: Materials for Genius Hour (individualized, or interdisciplinary or interst based projects)			
					Total:	$76,500.00