Martin County School District

Citrus Grove Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Citrus Grove Elementary

2527 SW CITRUS BLVD, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/cges

Demographics

Principal: Darcia Borel

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morrow, Todd	Principal	
Rynca, Rose	Assistant Principal	
Bookall, Rennay	School Counselor	
Tuma, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Ciliberti, Ashley	Instructional Media	
Logsdon, Kelsey	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/21/2020, Darcia Borel

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.*
13

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	76	103	92	83	90	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	9	6	13	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/21/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	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	

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	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	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	

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	
	(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	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0

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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	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	64
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	55
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 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?

N/A

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase academic growth (learning gains) in the area of English Language Arts with the use of purposeful planning.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase learning gains in the area of ELA from 56% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide interventions during additional time provided in the school master calendar and differentiate lessons when applicable. Materials will be used from the i-ready toolkit, Raz plus, and other research-based effective curricula.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tiered interventions support differentiation to fill reading gaps for struggling leaners according to Jefferson, R. E., Grant, C. E., & Sander, J. B. (2017). Teachers will progress monitor using Easy-cbm and review data at monthly data team meetings or as established by the intervention design teams.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the learning gain criteria for students in grade 5 in the area of ELA.
2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment results of with students- Data Chats to determine Growth Gains.
3. Progress monitor increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings.
4. Develop individual plans for those not making consistent increases
5. Grades 3 through 5 will use standards mastery on i-ready as a way to monitor progress for all students.
6. Increase the use of i-ready instruction with incentive rewards.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase academic growth (learning gains) in the area of English Language Arts for those in the lowest 25th percentile.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase academic growth (learning gains) in the area of ELA for those in the lowest 25th percentile from 51% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use professional learning team time to review current formative data on Common based assessments and plan instruction to meet the individual needs of all learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Thessin, R. A., & Starr, J. P. (2011), regular Professional Learning Communities foster teacher collaboration and problem solving that supports student academic growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the lowest 25th percentile on the initial diagnostic outcome for grades 4 and 5 in the area of ELA.
2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment of identified students.
3. Progress monitor increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings.
4. Develop individual plans for those not making consistent, expected increases.
5. Use of 'Fundations' program in earlier grades to increase the achievement of upcoming accountability grades.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase academic growth (learning goals) in the area of math for those in the lowest 25th percentile.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase academic growth (learning goals) in the area of math for those in the lowest 25th percentile from 53% to 59%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@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. Number talks in the classroom will assist student growth as they are supportive discussions to engage learners in problem solving and thinking about various ways to work through a problem.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Biro, K., & Dick, L. K. (2019), Number Talks have been proven effective in encouraging students of all ability levels to engage in critical thinking about numbers, problem solving, and counting. The exchange builds classroom communities that are engaging and flexible in response to mathematic critical response.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the probable lowest 25th percentile of students in grade 5 in the area of math.
2. Discuss initial diagnostic assessment results of with students- Data Chats to determine Growth Gains.
3. Monitor for increased achievement during monthly MTSS meetings.
4. Develop individualized plans for those not making consistent increases and filling learning gaps.
5.Daily Number talks to allow students to share their thinking and improve engagement.
6. Participate in an outside the school day math activity, such as a Publix Math Night.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Maintain or increase Science Assessment Student Proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain or increase Science Assessment Student Proficiency at or above 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	More time on task to create labs and review of previously taught standards assessed on Grade 5 science assessment test.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Zinger, D., Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2020), students participating in standards-aligned investigations that highlight the scientific process effectively increase student achievement with NGSS. Lab notebooks document multiple investigations over time, Students review and compare how they were similar and different, as well as review specific scientific vocabulary. Scaffolded learning allows students to first observe models of investigations and then collaboratively design and execute investigations to increase a locus of control for learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. District PD Coach guidance to support grade 3 and grade 4 assessed standards.
2. Encourage school wide entry into the district science fair.
3. Use of digital or paper-based science notebooks to create artifacts for student review overtime.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase sense of community in classrooms and around the school campus.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase sense of community in classrooms and around the school campus by lowering the number of referrals during the school year from the previous year. Increase the number of students that feel respected as documented on the student climate study questionnaire results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of community building strategies during the school day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hulvershorn, K., & Mulholland, S. (2018), building SEL with restorative circles improves school climates positively. Students will have opportunities to share about their feelings, learn positive coping strategies, and make teachers aware of which students may need additional supports as these relations are fostered.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly restorative circles to build a sense of community.
2. As a way to build confidence, the teachers will decorate the hallways with student artifacts.
3. Daily use of Stanford Harmony that have pre-made community building games and exercises.
4. Teachers will highlight to students the signage to promote character and expectations within contexts of the building.
5. Students will earn positive rewards for following school expectations and celebrated with opportunities to intrinsically embrace a positive social supportive culture.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Yearly Climate and Culture survey

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Classroom libraries, classroom sets, supplemental resources.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary			$1,000.00
			Notes: Classroom libraries, classroom sets, supplemental resources. that address the needs of the school's lowest quartertile students			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Classroom libraries, classroom sets, supplemental resources. that address the needs of the school's lowest quartertile students			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	5100	510-Supplies	0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary			$500.00
			Notes: Classroom supplies to support instruction.			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7000	239-Other	0371 - Citrus Grove Elementary			$500.00
			Notes: Incentive and rewards			
					Total:	**$4,000.00**