

Citrus County Schools

Crystal River Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Crystal River Middle School

344 NE CRYSTAL ST, Crystal River, FL 34428

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

Demographics

Principal: David Roland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	75%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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

To educate, motivate and drive success for all students through rigor, relevance, and relationships.

Provide the school's vision statement

All students are equipped to be successful contributors to the school, community and society.

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
Stringer, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Applegate, Maurisa	Assistant Principal	
Roland, David	Principal	
Lulenski, Alycia	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, David Roland

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

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)	75%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	317	296	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	47	41	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	69	70	0	0	0	0	161
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	48	44	0	0	0	0	117
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	53	72	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	45	55	0	0	0	0	165
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	52	45	0	0	0	0	172

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	70	74	81	0	0	0	0	225

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	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/22/2020

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	321	285	306	0	0	0	0	912
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	79	104	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	116	92	0	0	0	0	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	58	56	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	130	162	0	0	0	0	471

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	44	93	133	0	0	0	0	270

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	321	285	306	0	0	0	0	912
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	79	104	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	116	92	0	0	0	0	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	58	56	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	130	162	0	0	0	0	471

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	44	93	133	0	0	0	0	270

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	53%	56%	54%	52%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	54%	52%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	47%	34%	46%	47%
Math Achievement	53%	62%	58%	57%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains	46%	54%	57%	53%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	44%	51%	54%	54%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	51%	55%	51%	59%	56%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	76%	72%	58%	73%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	55%	-4%	52%	-1%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	62%	-12%	54%	-4%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	33%	49%	-16%	46%	-13%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	50%	52%	-2%	48%	2%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	74%	-14%	71%	-11%
2018	57%	71%	-14%	71%	-14%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	70%	26%	61%	35%
2018	99%	65%	34%	62%	37%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	57%	38%	57%	38%
2018	100%	52%	48%	56%	44%
Compare		-5%			

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	19	36	31	23	40	38	13	37			
BLK	43	53	31	28	29	28	25	60			

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
HSP	49	52	48	52	51	39	59	44	80		
MUL	42	39		43	39	25	40	27			
WHT	55	52	43	55	47	35	54	64	62		
FRL	48	49	41	48	43	32	48	57	48		

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	34	29	21	32	31	29	13			
BLK	24	35	40	27	42	56	20	38			
HSP	44	48	29	52	59	57	71	47	64		
MUL	38	35	17	38	38						
WHT	55	54	36	60	53	54	61	60	60		
FRL	47	49	33	52	49	53	52	54	48		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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

Math learning gains and bottom quartile gains. Lack of student engagement and high yield strategies.

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

Math learning gains and bottom quartile gains as well as 8th grade proficiency. Lack of student engagement and high yield strategies.

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 and bottom quartile gains as well as 8th grade proficiency. Lack of student engagement and high yield strategies.

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

ELA Bottom quartile learning gains
Focus on standards based instruction

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

Behavior and Course Failures

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

1. Improving Student Behavior
2. Implementation of High Yield Strategies
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: African American student and Multiracial student performance on 2019 FSA is below 41% on the Federal Index.

Measureable Outcome: Increase performance of African American and Multiracial students on the Federal Index by 5%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Stringer (stringera@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilization of Achieve 3000, USA Test Prep, AVID and mentors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: AAR research indicates that mentoring African American males increases academic performance. Research shows that multiracial students have a lack of personal connections due to issues related to cultural identity. AVID provides a framework for instructing multiracial students that will assist teachers with providing socially effective instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase the number of African American and multiracial students in AVID and Algebra.
2. Utilization of Achieve 3000 and USA Test Prep to track progress.
3. Continue mentoring program for African American and multiracial students.
4. Professional development on Culturally Relevant Teaching.

Person Responsible: Amanda Stringer (stringera@citruschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities performance on 2019 FSA is below 41% on the Federal Index.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase performance of students with disability on Federal Index by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzanne Hickman (hickmans@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Extreme Reading!
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The US DOE endorses the utilization of Extreme Reading! to increase student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Creation of 3 classes of Extreme Reading! with specific students chosen for this class.
2. Increase rigor through high yield instructional strategies.
3. Allocate resources for inclusionary practices.
4. Increase Least Restrictive Environment.
5. Increase the number of SWD in Algebra and AVID.

Person Responsible Suzanne Hickman (hickmans@citruschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve Student Behavior In 2019-2020, we had 1722 referrals. This led to a loss of instruction due to ISS/OSS. Additionally, attending to referrals limited assistant principals' time to lead curriculum/instruction. This also indicates a school culture that may have contributed to attendance issues.
---	---

Measureable Outcome: Average of less than 150 referrals per month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Stringer (stringera@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School Connect Social Skills program

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Many of the referrals related to lack of social skills. Research of programs that target middle schools students resulted in the selection of School Connect. Each module is developmentally scaffolded and each lesson is based on research specific to the lesson topic. It is included in the NREPP.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a year long schedule of social skills taught through PE.
2. Create community building and class meetings through homerooms.
3. Provide professional development on implementation of plan and resources.
4. Weekly positive student recognition in each class.

Person Responsible Alycia Lulenski (lulenskia@citruschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	State, district, and school data indicates a need for consistent, pervasive and frequently used research based instructional practices.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase learning gains of bottom quartile students on state assessments by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Vocabulary in Context, Extended thinking/Higher Order thinking, Summarization
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano/Max Thompson high yield strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development on high yield strategies.
2. Implement high yield strategies daily.
3. Embedded in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To decrease student failures in core curriculum courses, we will provide professional development on grading practices and high yield instructional strategies. In addition, counselors will run monthly grade reports. Students in danger of failing will be placed in grade recovery.

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.

1. Homeroom Class Meeting
2. Homeroom Community Building
3. School Spirit Day weekly
4. Athletic/extracurricular programs will adopt an area of school to maintain
5. Staff modeling campus cleanliness during transition times.
6. Staff presence at after school events (sign up through grade level meetings)
7. Daily CAT time - cleanliness, accountability, and enforcing the Big 3 (do what's right, do your best, and treat others as you want to be treated)

As social distancing allows:

1. Nonacademic parent nights, community BBQ, festival, alumni events
2. Acknowledge staff, clubs and parents at sporting events
3. After school club initiative
4. Home visits from Administrators, Counselors and Social worker
5. Bussing teachers through students' neighborhoods

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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