

Volusia County Schools

# Citrus Grove Elementary School



## 2019-20 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Citrus Grove Elementary School

729 HAZEN RD, Deland, FL 32720

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/citrusgrove/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Williams P

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

<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)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: A (62%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	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 Volusia 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Citrus Grove Elementary School

729 HAZEN RD, Deland, FL 32720

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/citrusgrove/pages/default.aspx>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.**

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

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

Eagles do their best and nothing less!

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Jennifer	Principal	Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers during the intervention block for ELA & Math: ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback to teachers and staff: conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings: Review Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support; Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.
Lalashuis, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Facilitate PL; Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with ESE and teachers to plan instruction; Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings; Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction; Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction. Responsible for updating SIP information and uploading to the CIMS site.
Martin, Timothy	Instructional Coach	Facilitate PL; Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with ESE and teachers to plan instruction; Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings; Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction; Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction. Collect and analyze data to share with the SLT Team
Camacho, Widalis	Assistant Principal	Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers during the intervention block for ELA & Math, ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback to teachers and staff, conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings. Review Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support; Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback. Provide assistance with EWS information and help review and edit the SIP.
HULSMAN, SAMANTHA	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan
Martello, Frank	Assistant Principal	Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers during the intervention block for ELA & Math, ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback to teachers and staff, conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings. Review Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support; Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.
Diedrichs, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Biegler, Emily	Teacher, ESE	Provide information regarding Students with Disabilities and other ESSA subgroups, attend SLT meetings, and provide input on the School Improvement Plan;
Harris, Erica	Other	Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers during the intervention block for ELA & Math: ongoing. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings: Review Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support; Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Walkthroughs & Feedback. Assist with student behavior and SEL SIP Focus Area

## 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	158	148	162	139	165	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	917
Attendance below 90 percent	31	17	18	14	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	34	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	3	0	1	1	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/20/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	60%	56%	57%	53%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	53%	45%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	56%	62%	58%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	43%	51%	49%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	57%	53%	65%	59%	51%

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

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	158 (0)	148 (0)	162 (0)	139 (0)	165 (0)	145 (0)	917 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	31 ( )	17 ( )	18 ( )	14 ( )	18 ( )	19 ( )	117 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 ( )	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	11 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	6 (0)	15 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	34 (0)	25 (0)	63 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	59%	5%	64%	0%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	20	41	38	29	48	58	30				
ELL	36	56	41	45	52	46	35				
ASN	67	80		67	40						
BLK	50	35		41	39		40				
HSP	46	57	42	51	60	53	42				
MUL	40	50		50	50						
WHT	69	64	57	66	53	50	76				
FRL	53	56	44	50	47	51	53				
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	25	32	25	35	36	19	19				
ELL	30	43	34	38	41	21	6				
ASN	71	54		93	77						
BLK	38	31		51	38		24				
HSP	38	46	32	42	37	17	43				
MUL	61	58		61	33						
WHT	64	58	47	66	51	37	64				
FRL	46	48	37	52	41	26	48				
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	15	36	38	30	41	39	42				
ELL	19	28	41	34	43	50					
ASN	62			92							
BLK	43	52		57	60		42				
HSP	37	44	52	48	55	61	58				

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
MUL	77			77							
WHT	60	55	39	68	57	42	71				
FRL	46	49	44	55	55	47	60				

### 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	57
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was at 48%, which was 5% lower than any other 2019 component. A contributing factors to the year's low performance was fidelity with appropriate response to intervention. Citrus Grove ELA Lowest 25th Percentile were 2% higher than the district at 46% and 5% lower than the state at 53%. From the 2018 data, Citrus Grove students in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased by 10% points, from 38% to 48%.

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

After reviewing the data, the component that showed the greatest decline was the cohort math achievement percentage from 4th grade to 5th grade. In 4th grade, 62% of students met proficiency while only 51% met proficiency in 5th grade. Statewide, the 4th to 5th grade proficiency rate went from 62% to 60%. This is a -9% gap between state cohort comparisons. The main factor that contributed to this decline was a lack of a scheduled math intervention time period in the master calendar for 5th grade.

**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.**

The data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Learning Gains. Math Learning Gains has a gap of 9 percentage points between the school and state average. Factors that contributed to this gap is a lack of a scheduled math intervention block as well as a lack of resources for math intervention.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed a 25 point improvement. The school identified and tracked the math lowest 25th percentile progress in PLC through data monitoring utilizing I-Ready Growth Monitoring Assessments and diagnostic growth measures. PLCs regularly discussed students in the Lowest 25th Percentile, interventions, and PST. Academic Coaches met with teachers to discuss interventions for individual students.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

1. Attendance
2. FSA Level 1 Students

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

1. SWD
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Math Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Lowest Quartile
<b>Rationale</b>	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 60%, ELA Learning Gains was 59% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 48% which was below the state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that the our Lowest Quartile students were also included in our targeted ESSA Subgroup: SWD that performed below 41%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 48% to 58%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.</li> <li>2. Facilitate PL on Interventions and PST Guidelines</li> <li>3. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data</li> <li>4. Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with ESE, ELL, and teachers to plan instruction with a focus specifically on lowest quartile and SWD.</li> <li>5. Implement Take Home Reading Baskets for family involvement. .</li> <li>6. Facilitate PL on IRLA Kits 1st Grade Teachers</li> <li>6. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings</li> <li>7) Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction.</li> <li>8) Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.</li> <li>9) Conduct four learning walks with coaches and teachers during small group instruction.</li> <li>10) Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs &amp; Feedback.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Learning Gains were at 53%, which is below the district and state averages. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Learning Gains in order to improve overall proficiency for all students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase Math Learning Gains from 53% to 56%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Response to Intervention
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Response to Intervention has a 1.20 effect size according to John Hattie. According to the Institute of Education Sciences, there is a strong level of evidence to support that instruction during the delivery of interventions should be explicit and systematic.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Review Math Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support.</li> <li>2) Facilitate PL on PST Process</li> <li>3) Facilitate PL on Pearson Intervention Tool Box</li> <li>4) Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data</li> <li>5) Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with ESE and teachers to plan instruction.</li> <li>6) Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings.</li> <li>7) Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction.</li> <li>8) Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.</li> <li>9) Conduct two learning walks with coaches and teachers during the intervention block.</li> <li>10) Monitor math interventions through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs &amp; Feedback.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Social Emotional Learning
<b>Rationale</b>	After reviewing the EWS report and experiencing an increased prevalence of childhood trauma among our students, our SLT decided to focus on Social Emotional Learning. By focusing on the social emotional needs of our students we will be able to ensure they develop daily routines, along with caring relationships with each other and adults on campus, thus contributing to an optimal learning environment and an increase in student achievement.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	100% of students will report they feel safe when answering the climate survey.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Responsive Classroom
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Responsive Classroom is an approach to teaching based on the belief that integrating academic and social-emotional skills creates an environment where students can do their best learning. The Responsive Classroom approach consists of a set of practices and strategies that build academic and social-emotional competencies. This approach works well with many other programs and can be introduced gradually into a teacher's practice. Independent research has found that the Responsive Classroom approach is associated with higher academic achievement in math and reading, improved school climate, and higher-quality instruction. It has been described by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) as one of the most "well-designed evidence-based social and emotional learning (SEL) programs".
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review EWS data and determine focus areas.</li> <li>2. Responsive Classroom Elementary Core Course for teachers and staff new to the Responsive Classroom Approach.</li> <li>3. Facilitate PL on Effective Management</li> <li>4. Facilitate PL on Dealing with Defiant Behavior</li> <li>5. Conduct monthly /bi-monthly committee meetings with PBIS team to monitor data and outcomes</li> <li>6. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in Responsive Classroom Practices.</li> <li>7. Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs &amp; Feedback.</li> <li>8. Facilitate Four Day Elementary Core Course</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

At Citrus Grove we provide opportunities throughout the year where students, teachers and families are able to build relationships. Some of these activities or events include: meet the teacher, open house, weekly summer media programs, after school clubs, tutoring, etc. The Master Schedule has a designated time each morning where teachers conduct their "Morning Meeting" in their classroom. The morning meeting allows students and teacher the opportunity to greet each other, determine a focus for the day and to build rapport and community within the classroom. Citrus Grove also has a teacher student mentoring program, Eagle Buddies. This program is implemented and monitored by the Positive Behavior Support team, who places identified students with varying needs with teachers and staff to establish positive relationships and additional support within the school setting.

### PFEP Link

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:

- Student mentoring program
- Peer mediation program
- Crisis Training program
- Suicide prevention program
- Bullying program

All students are screened for behavioral and social-emotional issues through the electronic report card. Through the screening, the school is able to dis-aggregate data to determine if individual students, classrooms, teachers, grade levels or the school would benefit from targeted interventions to address specific behavioral and social-emotional areas. Student services personnel (i.e., school psychologists, school counselor, and school social workers), provide direct and indirect evidencebased supports to students identified through the screening measure.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

At the beginning of each school year, we offer a Kindergarten Orientation Night for families to meet their teachers and learn about Kindergarten expectations and school procedures. In addition, families receive information regarding transportation, free/reduced lunch, social emotional learning, and PTA.

At the end of each school year, our 5th grade students meet with school counselors from both Deland Middle School and Southwestern to learn about the classes and electives offered at the middle school level. Students are given the opportunity to choose which electives they would like to participate in.

Additionally, ESE Articulation Meetings take place for students transitioning from VPK and to middle school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Our school's leadership team consists of the principal, 2 assistant principals, TOA, 2 academic coaches, and school counselor. This team reviews student progress data, develops intervention and remediation strategies, monitors instructional support, provides professional development, and celebrates student success. Curriculum and Instructional Resources include professional learning opportunities provided by our district and our school's leadership team. The District purchased new curriculum resources/textbooks for ELA and Math. Grade-level PLCs meet weekly with Academic Coaches/Administration to collaborate on analyzing student progress data, planning instruction, developing assessments and discuss intervention strategies. Our school focuses on meeting the needs of all students social and emotional needs by utilizing Responsive Classroom. The goal is to create a caring and engaging school community which focuses on increasing student achievement. Our methodology for coordinating and supplementing funds starts with the Federal and state funds allocated by the district according to student need as demonstrated by poverty level and student achievement performance. District and SLT's work together to coordinate and integrate federal, state, and local funds, services and programs for the benefit of students. School Improvement funds are awarded to the school based on a per pupil funding formula and distributed via the School Advisory Council through a grant process. The SIP is data-driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. At the end of the year all grade level teams meet with the school leadership team to review student performance data including state and district assessments, grades, discipline and attendance to reflect and discuss successes and challenges at each grade level. Over the summer, our Team Resource made up of ESE and ESOL teachers work very closely with classroom teachers and leadership team to create a plan for the upcoming year.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

We cultivate professional learning communities within college institutions by partnering with Stetson University and Daytona State's Education Program. Our partnership with the Deland Rotary Club provides our 3rd grade students with dictionaries each year. Our school is a Monarch Butterfly garden encourages students learn about local conservation and preservation, while introducing students to careers within the science field.

We invite graduating Seniors from Deland High School to lead our 5th grade clap out. As Citrus Grove Alumni, these students also have the opportunity to apply for a PTA Scholarship, where graduates come and speak to the students about future plans for college and potential careers. We partner with Deland High School where they host a Citrus Grove Spirit Night for upcoming bulldogs. Our primary grade levels host Vehicle Day, where community members provide information about jobs in the community. Classroom teachers provide numerous field trips for their students to gain hands on learning experience. Some examples of field trips provided are: Gem Mining, zoo, Marine Science Center, Reptile Discovery Center, Wonder Works, Sea World, St. Augustine, and the Pioneer Art Settlement.

## Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile</b>				<b>\$68,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$36,000.00
			<i>Notes: IRLA Starter Kit The IRLA/ENIL is the essential diagnostic and formative assessment tool that enables teachers to establish a baseline reading level and outline a course of remediation, acceleration, or maintenance for each child and his/her family. Reading Acquisition Skills Cards serve as family -friendly versions of each IRLA level, outlining the skills, standards, and habits students need to master at that level. Rotating leveled classroom libraries put authentic trade books color-coded to each IRLA level at the fingertips of teachers and students, giving each student instant access to just -right text for independent practice, coaching, and conferencing.</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Books for Elementary Program K-12 Benchmark Classroom Libraries: Elementary (5 basket collection) A 5-basket version of our Classroom Library comprised of our 30-book Elementary baskets. Grade-level libraries are customized to meet the reading level needs of each specific classroom. 30 books per basket Y-Or</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Veritcal Teaming Walkthroughs for all k-5 Teachers</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$17,500.00
			<i>Notes: Guided Planning for ELA Curriculum</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: PLC Extended data and analysis &amp; intervention planning</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: SSYRA and SSYRA Jr. Books</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains</b>				<b>\$124,253.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School	General Fund		\$49,213.00
			<i>Notes: Academic Coach</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$50,000.00
			<i>Notes: Veritcal Teaming Walkthroughs for all k-5 Teachers</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$2,540.00
			<i>Notes: Math manipulatives</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$17,500.00

			<i>Notes: Guided Planning for Math /Science Curriculum</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: PLC Extended data and analysis &amp; intervention planning</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning</b>				<b>\$31,891.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$11,891.00
			<i>Notes: Parent Liason</i>			
			7981 - Citrus Grove Elementary School			\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: Responsive Classroom Professioanl Learning Opportunities &amp; resources</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$224,644.00</b>