

Martin County School District

Citrus Grove Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Citrus Grove Elementary

2527 SW CITRUS BLVD, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/cges

Demographics

Principal: Darcia Borel

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 25% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (72%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Citrus Grove Elementary

2527 SW CITRUS BLVD, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/cges

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 | No | 22% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 21% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

The mission of Citrus Grove Elementary is to provide opportunities for students to achieve their personal best and become responsible, healthy, and productive citizens who embrace lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cultivating Generations of Excellence

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Morrow, Todd | Principal | |
| Webb, Connie | Instructional Coach | |
| Rynca, Rose | Assistant Principal | |
| Bookall, Rennay | School Counselor | |

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 | 117 | 110 | 104 | 110 | 118 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 678 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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)

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/30/2019

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 | |
| 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 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 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 | |
| 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 | 12 | |
| 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 | 72% | 58% | 57% | 75% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 59% | 58% | 64% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | 56% | 53% | 45% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 74% | 65% | 63% | 76% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 65% | 62% | 67% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 53% | 51% | 48% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 70% | 58% | 53% | 68% | 55% | 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 | 117 (0) | 110 (0) | 104 (0) | 110 (0) | 118 (0) | 119 (0) | 678 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 (0) | 8 (0) | 11 (0) | 10 (0) | 7 (0) | 11 (0) | 57 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 11 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (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) | 3 (0) | 8 (0) | 11 (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 | 74% | 54% | 20% | 58% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 57% | 22% | 57% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 69% | 57% | 12% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 55% | 16% | 56% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 73% | 55% | 18% | 56% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 58% | 15% | 55% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 58% | 11% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 63% | 17% | 62% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 64% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 62% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 64% | 11% | 60% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 64% | 15% | 61% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 71% | 53% | 18% | 53% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 55% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 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 | 47 | 32 | 25 | 44 | 57 | 45 | | | | | |
| ELL | 61 | 70 | | 56 | 75 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 67 | | 62 | 59 | 36 | 67 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 54 | 51 | 75 | 68 | 58 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 45 | 40 | 61 | 58 | 50 | 63 | | | | |
| 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 | 43 | 50 | 38 | 58 | 67 | 71 | 28 | | | | |
| ELL | 64 | 55 | | 64 | 64 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 78 | 50 | 76 | 78 | | 71 | | | | |
| MUL | 70 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 55 | 37 | 77 | 65 | 56 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 48 | 33 | 65 | 65 | | 41 | | | | |

| 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 | 32 | 33 | 20 | 45 | 39 | 39 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 60 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 65 | 57 | 69 | 66 | 36 | 61 | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 64 | 41 | 77 | 67 | 52 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 53 | 47 | 64 | 64 | 44 | 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 508 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 65 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 62 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 showing the lowest performance in the 2019-2019 school year is ELA Learning Gains. There was a 3% decline from 59% achieving ELA Learning Gains in 2018 to 56% achieving ELA Learning Gains in 2019. Some contributing factors to last year's performance include a lack of higher order thinking questioning occurring in the classroom, as well as a lack of grouping and differentiation.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is math achievement. There was a 3% decline from 77% math achievement in 2018 to 74% math achievement in 2019. A factor that contributed to this was a decline in the multiple opportunities for all students to demonstrate learning where the teacher is providing feedback.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Learning Gains. The state average is at 58% and the school average is at 56%. Some factors that may have contributed to this gap include a lack of student evidence to monitor progress and a lack of purposely planned higher order thinking questions that are aligned to standards.

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 science achievement. There was an 8% increase from 62% science achievement in 2018 to 70% science achievement in 2019. We created additional push in time for the science lab teacher to work with students and teachers. We planned a school-wide STEM day to bring more awareness to science. We also adopted a new science curriculum.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, one potential concern is in the area of student attendance. We have approximately 57 students whose attendance is below 90%.

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

1. Increase learning gains of ELA
2. . Increase learning gains of ELA lowest 25th percentile
- 3.. Maintain and/or increase Science Achievement
4. Increase learning gains of Math lowest 25th percentile
5. Increase professional learning opportunities by way of Professional Learning Communities (PLC cycle)
6. Increase sense of community - Classroom, school, etc

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

| | |
|---|---|
| Title | Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of English Language Arts |
| Rationale | Purposeful planning for the students identified as the Lowest 25% will increase learning gains. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase learning gains in the area of ELA from 56% to 59%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Provide interventions during additional time provided in school day and differentiation of lessons, when applicable |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the learning gain criteria for students in grade 4 and grade 5 in the area of ELA. 2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment of identified students. 3. Monitor increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings. 4. Develop individual plans for those not making increase. 5. Classes in grades 3-5 will use the standards mastery on I-Ready as a way to monitor progress for all students. 6. Increase the use of I Ready instruction- use of incentives rewards. |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of English Language Art Lowest 25th Percentile |
| Rationale | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of English Language Art Lowest 25th Percentile from 51% to 56% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Use Professional Learning Team time to review current formative data and plan instruction to meet the needs of all learners |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the probable Lowest 25th percent of students in grade 4 and grade 5 in the area of ELA. 2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment of identified students. 3. Monitor increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings. 4. Develop individual plans for those not making increase. 5. Use of Foundations program in earlier grades to increase the achievement of upcoming accountability grades. |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| #3 | |
| Title | Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of Math Lowest 25th Percentile. |
| Rationale | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 53% to 58% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Use Professional Learning Team time to review current formative data and plan instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Investigate the the use of Number Talks (ie possible book study, support from district coach) |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the probable Lowest 25th percent of students in grade 4 and grade 5 in the area of Math. 2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment of identified students. 3. Monitor increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings. 4. Develop individual plans for those not making increase. 5. Participate in a local Publix Math night. |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #4 | |
| Title | Maintain or increase Science Assessment Student Proficiency |
| Rationale | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Maintain or increase Science Assessment Student Proficiency at or above 70% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | More time on task to create labs and the review of previously taught standards assessed on Grade 5 Science Assessment test. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Continue the addition of Science minutes per week to all Grade 5 students- focus on the grade 3-4 level standards address on the state assessment. |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| #5 | |
| Title | Increase opportunities of professional collaboration. |
| Rationale | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase opportunities of professional collaboration by weekly Professional Learning Collaborative Teams, Learning Walks designed around the focus on school wide data analysis and 'Look At' teaching strategy implementation. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Grade level teams participate weekly in the Professional Learning Collaborative Team meetings. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Design weekly Professional Learning Collaborative Teams that discuss common summative assessments. 2. When appropriate, teachers, admin and coach provide professional learning opportunities designed around school wide 'Look Ats' |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #6 | |
| Title | Increase sense of community - Classroom, school, etc |
| Rationale | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Lower the number of referrals processed during the school year from the previous. Increase the number of students that feel respected - as documented in the Climate Study questionnaire results. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Todd Morrow (morrowt@martin.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Use of Community Building strategies during the school day. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Weekly Restorative Circle to build a sense of community 2. As a way to build confidence, motivate and inspire the third grade students, the teachers will decorate the hallway. 3. Daily use of Stanford Harmony that have pre-made community building games/activities. |
| Person Responsible | Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.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 V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|--|----------------|-----|------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of English Language Arts | | | | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of English Language Art Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase academic growth (Learning Gains) in the area of Math Lowest 25th Percentile. | | | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Maintain or increase Science Assessment Student Proficiency | | | | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase opportunities of professional collaboration. | | | | \$5,366.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | 261013-IN STATE TRAVEL | 0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary | | | \$5,366.00 |
| | | | Notes: Learning Sciences International Building Expertise Educators Conference June 17-19 Lake Buena Vista, FL | | | |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase sense of community - Classroom, school, etc | | | | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--------|------------|
| Total: | \$5,366.00 |
|--------|------------|