

Citrus County Schools

# Rock Crusher 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>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Rock Crusher Elementary School

814 S ROCK CRUSHER RD, Homosassa, FL 34448

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sean Furniss**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2018

<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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<b>Black/African American Students</b> Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<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>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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.

While educating the whole child, we at Rock Crusher Elementary School strive to assist the children in becoming life long learners, unique individuals, and people who make a difference.

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

### 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
Furniss, Sean	Principal	
Myers, Cindy	Instructional Coach	
Dillersberger, Jackie	Teacher, ESE	
Ramallo, Sarahy	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/15/2018, Sean Furniss

**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.*

1

**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**

37

#### 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)	[Data Not Available]
<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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<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>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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	81	85	86	74	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	5	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	3	6	4	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	2	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

**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	3	2	2	2	6	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	7	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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**

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	11	9	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	3	7	11	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**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	7	12	3	1	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	11	9	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	3	7	11	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**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	7	12	3	1	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	

**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	67%	59%	57%	66%	61%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	56%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	48%	53%	42%	40%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	63%	74%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	54%	62%	60%	66%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	39%	51%	55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	60%	53%	63%	63%	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.**

<b>ELA</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>
03	2019	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	71%	58%	13%	56%	15%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

<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>
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
	2018	80%	67%	13%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	81%	66%	15%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	60%	60%	0%	60%	0%
	2018	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

<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	58%	58%	0%	53%	5%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	55	73	73	65	66	53	56				
BLK	30			50							
HSP	60	79		50	47		40				
MUL	83	100		92	90						
WHT	67	60	61	71	53	43	63				
FRL	66	62	67	68	54	44	56				
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	55	54	36	58	73	60					
BLK	58	70		75	90						
HSP	59	62		76	85						
MUL				100							
WHT	67	53	49	80	67	54	66				
FRL	68	57	59	78	70	56	63				
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	40	33	21	33	33	36	33				
BLK	36			50							
HSP	88			71							
MUL	67			83							
WHT	66	55	34	76	62	63	64				
FRL	62	56	44	70	57	54	59				

**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	60
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	63
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	60
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	60
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.**

4th Grade Math BQ students; 5th Grade Math BQ Students:

Half of the 5th grade students received math instruction from a teacher new to the grade level, instructional support was added after the analysis of the first Citrus Assessment; Study Island and Success Maker were not implemented with fidelity; Mid-year, a long term substitute in fourth grade was replaced with a certified teacher; We relied heavily on a variety of supplemental math programs which were not closely monitored.

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

Learning gains in Mathematics. Half of the 5th grade students received math instruction from a teacher new to the grade level, instructional support was added after the analysis of the first Citrus Assessment; Study Island and Success Maker were not implemented with fidelity; Mid-year, a long term substitute in fourth grade was replaced with a certified teacher; We relied heavily on a variety of supplemental math programs which were not closely monitored.

**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.**

Bottom Quartile in Mathematics; State: 46%, RCE: 43%

Half of the 5th grade students received math instruction from a teacher new to the grade level, instructional support was added after the analysis of the first Citrus Assessment; Study Island and Success Maker were not implemented with fidelity; Mid-year, a long term substitute in fourth grade was replaced with a certified teacher; We relied heavily on a variety of supplemental math programs which were not closely monitored.

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

Bottom Quartile Learning Gains in ELA; State: 45%; RCE: 65%

Before school tutoring focused on ELA (Success Maker Teams); increased ELA block (120 minutes);

Heavier focus on ELA Citrus Assessment data analysis; targeted Title I interventions in K-5 focused on foundational literacy skills

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

Attendance

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

1. Increase student achievement in the area of Math
2. Improve student achievement in Science
3. Maintain an emphasis on student engagement as it relates to small group.
4. We will monitor student attendance with the goal of improvement.
5. We will continue to emphasize the importance of learning gains in ELA.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Increase student achievement in the area of Math. We scored 29% on Math FSA with our bottom quartile in 4th, and 36% on Math FSA bottom quartile in 5th grade.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	Our 5th grade bottom quartile learning gains will achieve at or above the state average in the area of Math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will implement and monitor i-Ready with fidelity.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	It has a proven track record of success in Florida schools. Our pilot school achieved and A two years ago. We were showing strong growth in our winter diagnostic last year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We will monitor the implementation of iReady through data debriefing on a weekly basis.
2. We will utilize Title 1 interventionists to provide assistance to targeted students.
3. We will have quarterly data days to dissect data and determine best practices to meet the needs of students.
4. Teachers will use 4 square in their classrooms to spiral curriculum.

**Person Responsible** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Maintain student engagement as it relates to small group in small group instruction. Student engagement is imperative to student achievement.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	In our walkthroughs and observations we will have 90% of our teachers marked as proficient or distinguished under the category "Opportunity and support for participation and meaning making".
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will emphasize the 5D tool, specifically as it relates to student engagement.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research shows that student engagement is paramount to increasing student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We will observe teaching practices through walkthroughs and observations.
2. We will analyze walkthroughs and observational data in administrative meetings.
3. The instructional coach will be used to provide coaching, feedback, and resources to enhance instruction.

**Person Responsible** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will continue to emphasize the importance of learning gains in ELA. While we have shifted our focus to address the needs of mathematics, we do not want to lose sight of the strides we made in ELA learning gains during the 2019 school year.

**Measureable Outcome:** ELA Learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains will reflect 63% and 65% respectively or higher as measured by FSA ELA grade 5. Students in grade levels K-4 will score at or above the district average as measured by EOY Data Source.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use iReady, FSA ELA, and Data Source K-3 data to determine student progress and plan for differentiation and achievement, specifically those students in the lower 25th percentile. We will incorporate tutoring that will address the needs of our African- American students in ELA. Our iReady Path will allow us to identify the needs of this subgroup, and differentiate accordingly. We will work to continue fostering relationships with those students and parents so we can rise above 41% on the federal index.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** iReady, FSA ELA, and Data Source K-3 are standards-based assessments which will allow us to collectively pinpoint and address specific areas of need. Our African-American subgroup scored at 40% on the federal index. By addressing the needs of this subgroup in ELA our scores should exceed 41% for the 2021 school year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Analyze iReady data to identify areas of need and celebrate areas of growth
2. Closely track progress of African American students
3. Collaboration among teachers to plan ELA instruction on a weekly basis
4. Teachers in 1st grade will use Sing/ Spell for phonics instruction. 2nd grade will utilize Words Their Way.
5. Administration will meet with teachers monthly to discuss data sheets and grade correlations

**Person Responsible** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will increase student achievement in the area of Science. We decreased by 6 points on the Statewide 5th grade Science assessment during 2019.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will increase our student proficiency by 5% as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will track and monitor the planning and implementation of standards-based lessons in Science.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The curriculum was under utilized in past practices. We can extract more resources from the curriculum.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize district- based Science TOSA to plan and model standards- based lessons.
2. Continue school-wide STEM days and Science night.
3. Emphasize Science specific vocabulary through word of the week.

**Person Responsible** Sean Furniss (furnisss@citruschools.org)



**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** We will strive to decrease our amount of students assigned ISS throughout the year. When students are in class they are far more capable of achieving academic and social goals. However, we will strive to protect the instruction of ALL students in the classroom.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will decrease the amount of students in ISS by 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sean Furniss (furniss@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use Time to Teach and Sanford Harmony to address Tier 1 behaviors and stabilize student conduct. Teachers will monitor behavior data, and communicate with parents and shareholders. 2019- 2020 data has shown that disciplinary consequences have minimized repeat disruptions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Time to Teach is a research proven program that encourages students to reflect on their behavior choices. Sanford Harmony is a district and researched approved program that fosters classroom community and empathy for others. Classroom teachers will encourage students through a classroom management system to make correct choices, and then communicate results with both students and their parents.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Time to Teach will be used in each class for Tier 1 behavioral intervention.
2. Sanford Harmony will be used for Meet Up, Buddy Up activities as well as to build classroom community and culture.
3. Classroom teachers will encourage students through a classroom management system to make correct choices, and then communicate results with both students and their parents. This will happen specifically when Tier 1 behaviors are extending towards Tier 2 or 3.
4. We need to strive to recognize positive behaviors as well.

**Person Responsible:** Sarahy Ramallo (ramallos@citruschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

1. We will observe teaching practices through walkthroughs and observations.
2. We will analyze walkthrough/ observation data during administrative meetings.
3. Instructional Coach will be used to provide coaching feedback and resources to enhance instruction.
4. We will continue to emphasize teacher circulation to enhance small group instruction.

**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.

Beginning this year our teachers in grades K-2 will implement lessons for 30 minutes on behavior three times a week. The standards covered by Sanford Harmony tie in with ELA, so this time will occur during the ELA block or during SPA time. Teachers will use Sanford Harmony and other supplemental resources to plan and deliver instruction throughout the school year. The 30 minute block to instruct on behavioral practices will be documented in weekly lesson plans. Administration will meet with teachers during monthly meetings and do classroom walkthroughs to ensure this prescription is being followed with fidelity.

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

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