# Citrus Grove Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (56%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%)<br><br>2016-17: B (55%)<br><br>2015-16: C (50%) |
| **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** | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

## 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

# 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) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 69% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 40% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | C | B |

## 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.**

We will ignite a passion for learning in all students to be productive citizens.

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

Eagles do their best and nothing less!

### 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 |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Williams, Jennifer | Principal | 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 | 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 and professional learning. |
| Martello, Frank | Assistant Principal | 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. |
| Harris, Erica | Other | 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 |
| Sande, Courtney | Teacher, K-12 | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Dunn, Mary | Teacher, ESE | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. |
| Hutchinson, Patricia | Teacher, K-12 | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. |
| Greboz, Nicole | Instructional Technology | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. |
| Copes, Dana | School Counselor | Attend SLT Meetings and facilitate PBIS team meetings. Teacher support for SEL SIP goal, and student lessons. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Jennifer Williams P

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
57

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (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<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
|---|---|
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (56%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%)<br><br>2016-17: B (55%)<br><br>2015-16: C (50%) |

| **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** | TS&I |

| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). |
|---|

## Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| Number of students enrolled | 69 | 122 | 124 | 135 | 121 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 705 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 17 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

**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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/3/2020

## 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 | 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 | |

## 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 | 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 | |

## 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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 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% | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| 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% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 64 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 48 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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.**

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 to the year's low performance was fidelity with appropriate response to intervention. An additional contributing factor to ELA Lowest 25th Percentile data component being our lowest component is that in the 2019-2020 school year our students were faced with a global pandemic that disrupted their traditional learning environment for the entire fourth nine weeks. 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%, from 38% to 48%.

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

In 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. The main factor that contributed to this decline was the lack of scheduled math intervention time period in the master calendar for 5th grade. Statewide, the 4th to 5th grade proficiency rate went from 62% to 60%. This is a -9% gap between state cohort comparisons.

**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?**

1. Attendance

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

1. SWD
2. ELA Lowest Quartile
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Social Emotional & Academic Learning slides as a direct result of COVID-19

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | 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%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 48% to 58%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teacher-led Small Group Interventions |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Intervention for students with learning needs has a .77 effect size and small group instruction has a .47 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. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Develop intervention plan with intervention teachers and reading coach to determine tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Facilitate PL on Interventions and PST Guidelines

| **Person Responsible** | Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

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.

| **Person Responsible** | Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Continue implementation of Take Home Reading Baskets for family involvement.

| **Person Responsible** | Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in intervention instruction.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor intervention instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | 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. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase Math Learning Gains from 53% to 56%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Response to Intervention |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Review Math Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para support. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with ESE and teachers to plan instruction. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Monitor math interventions through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| PL will be provided to teachers through grade level PLC's to train teachers on Response to Intervention using enVision Mathematics. | |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | 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. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 100% of students will report they feel safe when answering the climate survey |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Responsive Classroom, a student-centered, social and emotional learning approach to teaching and discipline. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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". |

### Action Steps to Implement

Review EWS data and determine focus areas.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Conduct PBIS Training for Trauma Informed Care and Social Emotional Learning.

| **Person Responsible** | Dana Copes (djcopes@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Conduct PBIS Training for School Procedures and Discipline.

| **Person Responsible** | Dana Copes (djcopes@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Conduct monthly /bi-monthly committee meetings with PBIS team to monitor data and outcomes.

| **Person Responsible** | Erica Harris (eaharris@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**We have considered our SWD and incorporated them into the action steps of our three areas of focus.**

## 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.

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, 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.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.