

Citrus County Schools

Lecanto Primary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto Primary School

3790 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lps.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Vicki Lofton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2012

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 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.

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

In connection with its children, families, and community, LPS promises to provide quality instruction, a challenging learning environment, and a lasting partnership to create life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement

Bringing inspiration and innovation to every student!

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
Lofton, Vicki	Principal	Lead staff, students, and families to strong levels of achievement.
Baize, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal in leading the school community to high levels of success.
Bowman, Shennen	Guidance Counselor	Counseling, teaching social skills, mental health, assist families in need with outside agencies, attendance, support to teachers with struggling students, support students with challenging behaviors with helping teach replacement behaviors.
Collins, Debi	Other	ESE Specialist, assist in the identification and support of students with special needs
Loreth, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Assisting teachers in all academic areas, coaching/modeling instructional methods and strategies, analyzing student achievement for the purpose of assisting teachers to better reach the needs of the students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2012, Vicki Lofton

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	88	90	92	78	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	8	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	4	9	3	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	5	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	119	125	133	124	138	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	9	8	15	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	18	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	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	119	125	133	124	138	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	9	8	15	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	18	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	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	57%	59%	57%	55%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	51%	50%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	48%	53%	37%	41%	48%
Math Achievement	60%	60%	63%	66%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains	51%	54%	62%	63%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	39%	51%	36%	39%	47%
Science Achievement	60%	60%	53%	56%	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	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	55%	58%	-3%	56%	-1%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	58%	0%	53%	5%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	21	30	18	11	5					
ELL	36			55							
HSP	62	56		62	56		55				
MUL	30			27							
WHT	58	50	35	61	52	33	60				
FRL	55	49	33	53	45	31	55				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	35	29	27	27	11	23				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
HSP	62	56		68	76						
MUL	64			57							
WHT	54	52	38	66	60	33	58				
FRL	49	49	36	61	58	35	51				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	50
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	46
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

Our percentage of iReady Lesson Passed for ELA, 3rd through 5th grade, fell below the 70% target. 5th grade showed the most significant deficit at 53%.

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

According to district benchmark assessment, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas was a contributing factor to 3rd grade's deficit. Key Ideas and Details dropped for 4th and 5th grade students.

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

No state data available due to the cancellation of state testing at the end of the year.

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

While no state data was available, our district assessment which is closely aligned to state testing, showed an improvement in Integration of Knowledge in 3rd grade and Key Ideas and Details in 4th and 5th grade. Our school implemented iReady for ELA and Math as well as LAFS and MAFS. These 2 programs provided students with rigorous standards-based instruction on grade level as well as individualized instruction.

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

Based on EWS, 2 areas of concern are our students with 1 or more suspensions and students with potential course failure in ELA and/or Math.

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA
2. Increase student achievement in Math
3. Increase student achievement in ELA and Math for multi-racial subgroup
4. Increase student achievement in ELA and Math for students with disabilities subgroup
5. Identify and support students with social and emotional needs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in ELA. Through the use of iReady, students received individualized standards-based instruction. Student achievement for iReady was at 68% for 3rd grade, 61% for 4th grade, and 53% for 5th grade for Lessons Passed.

Measureable Outcome: Achievement levels, learning gains, and bottom quartile will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points to reach the target of 70%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citrussschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady/LAFS will be implemented for whole group explicit instruction, online independent student practice/support, and tiered intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on last year's data, we chose evidence-based iReady and LAFS materials to implement rigorous standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue implementation of iReady/LAFS.
2. Use of iReady Toolbox Resources
3. Instructional Coaching
4. Collaboration and Data Monitoring
5. Supplemental Vocabulary Materials (Wordly Wise)

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citrussschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve student achievement in math. Student achievement for math Lessons Passed in iReady for 5th grade was 68%
Measureable Outcome:	Math achievement level, bottom quartile, multiracial subgroup and SWD subgroup will increase by 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady/MAFS will be implemented for whole group explicit instruction, online independent student practice/support, and tiered interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose evidence-based iReady program to implement rigorous standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue implementation of iReady
2. Continue implementation of MAFS
3. Collaboration and data monitoring
4. Instructional Coaching
5. Grade level collaboration and creation of skill application practice

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Early Warning System, threat assessment, and discipline data identifies significant need for social and emotional learning.
Measureable Outcome:	Decrease the number of discipline referrals. Increase the number of positive referrals, student recognition, and PBIS participation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shennen Bowman (bowmans@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide PBIS and daily Sanford Harmony lessons, strategies, and activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony curriculum promotes positive social and emotional behaviors. PBIS establishes social culture and behavioral supports needed for all students for social and academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Daily Sanford Harmony
2. Quarterly PBIS events
3. Social skills instruction by school counselor
4. Partnership with community counseling services
5. Professional Development "Emotional Poverty" by Ruby Payne Book Study

Person Responsible Shennen Bowman (bowmans@citruschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in ELA and Math for our Multi-Racial Subgroup. In 2018-2019, our multi-racial subgroup was 30% of 3 and above on FSA. In 2019-2020, on the District Assessments, 3rd grade scored an average of 53% in ELA and 46%, 4th grade 51% in ELA and 49% in Math, and 5th grade 78% in ELA and 57% in Math.

Measureable Outcome: Students will increase achievement by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady/LAFS/MAFS will be implemented for whole group explicit instruction, online independent student practice/support, and tiered intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We chose evidence-based iReady to implement rigorous standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use Sanford Harmony lessons to improve inclusive practices
2. Implementation of iReady
3. Implement LAFS/MAFS
4. Instructional coaching
5. Collaboration and Data Monitoring

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in ELA and Math for the SWD subgroup. In 2018-2019, ELA achievement data level for SWD subgroup was 15% 3 and above for ELA and 18% for Math. In 2019-2020, on District Assessment, in ELA, 3rd grade scored 51%, 4th grade 56%, and 5th grade 61%. In math, 3rd grade scored 39%, 4th grade 36%, and 5th grade 39%.

Measureable Outcome: ELA and Math achievement will increase by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady/LAFS/MAFS will be implemented through explicit whole group instruction, online independent student practice/support and tiered interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence based iReady program to implement rigorous standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of iReady
2. ESE staffing specialist meeting with ESE teachers to review data and plan for instruction
3. Instructional Coaching
4. Collaboration and data monitoring with the classroom general education teacher
5. Implementation of LAFS and MAFS

Person Responsible Vicki Lofton (loftonv@citruschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

We are a PBIS school which helps us establish positive social culture and behavior. We utilize Sanford Harmony curriculum to support building positive social and emotional skills, and build character. We review parent, staff, and student surveys to gain perspective from all stakeholders. We work together with our School Advisory Council (which encompasses staff, families, and students) in creating and facilitating school improvement goals.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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