Volusia County Schools

Citrus Grove Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 20

Positive Culture & Environment 25

Budget to Support Goals 26

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 (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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 20

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 26

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position 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.
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. AVID Team Leader
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	Teacher, K-12	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. Responsible for updating SIP information and uploading to the CIMS site. AVID Team Leader
Martin, Timothy	Math 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. AVID Team Leader
Lalashuis, Stephanie	Reading 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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Copes, Dana	School Counselor	Attend SLT Meetings and facilitate PBIS team meetings. Teacher support for SEL SIP goal, and student lessons.
Derstine, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning.
Whidden, Kayla	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning.
Sande, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. AVID Team Leader
Hutchinson, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. Literacy Team Member
Diedrichs, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. Literacy Team Member
Makowske, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning. Literacy Team Member
Evans, Katie	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning.

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

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

819

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	143	135	130	129	144	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	11	30	25	21	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				60%	56%	57%	54%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	52%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	53%	38%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	59%	63%	59%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	56%	62%	46%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	43%	51%	28%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	57%	53%	54%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	59%	5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Kindergarten- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT, FLKRS, VPAS
First- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT
Second- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT
Third- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT
Fourth- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT
Fifth Grade- Topic Checks, iReady Diagnostic Tests, VLT

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	117/17.95%	132/40.91%	133/63.91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/13.10%	95/35.79%	98/58.16%
	Students With Disabilities	22/9.09%	25/12%	23/26.09%
	English Language Learners	6/33.33%	7/71.43%	8/75%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	114/12.28%	121/35.54%	129/61.24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81/9.88%	89/29.21%	93/55.91%
	Students With Disabilities	20/10%	22/13.64%	22/40.91%
	English Language Learners	6/16.67%	7/42.86%	7/41.88%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	120/34.17%	147/46.94%	137/55.47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79/31.65%	98/40.82%	90/51.11%
	Students With Disabilities	27/7.41%	37/21.62%	31/29.03%
	English Language Learners	18/27.78%	21/23.81%	21/28.57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	118/11.86%	148/33.78%	132/52.27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/10.26%	95/29.47%	88/45.45%
	Students With Disabilities	25/8%	35/17.14%	30/30%
	English Language Learners	17/0%	18/22.22%	21/33.33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	131/55.73%	140/67.86%	135/82.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	95/50.53%	101/60.40%	95/81.05%
	Students With Disabilities	31/22.58%	31/32.26%	29/41.38%
	English Language Learners	21/33.33%	19/36.84%	20/70%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	130/14.62%	139/40.29%	135/57.04%
	Economically Disadvantaged	93/12.98%	100/37%	96/50%
	Students With Disabilities	29/10.34%	30/20%	29/27.59%
	English Language Learners	20/10%	20/10%	21/42.86%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	121/33.88%	130/51.54%	133/49.62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80/26.25%	87/43.68%	87/37.93%
	Students With Disabilities	35/8.57%	39/15.38%	38/26.32%
	English Language Learners	21/14.29%	22/36.36%	22/22.73%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	120/17.50%	126/46.83%	129/61.24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81/14.81%	85/41.18%	87/56.32%
	Students With Disabilities	35/8.57%	37/24.32%	37/43.24%
	English Language Learners	21/9.52%	22/40.91%	22/68.18%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	126/33.59%	130/50.35%	134/50.35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	87/26.67%	92/43%	93/45.92%
	Students With Disabilities	13/0%	14/17.65%	14/6.67%
	English Language Learners	12/23.08%	14/42.86%	14/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	131/23.66%	131/49.62%	140/61.43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	91/17.58%	93/37.63%	99/53.54%
	Students With Disabilities	15/0%	15/13.33%	14/28.57%
	English Language Learners	13/30.77%	14/57.14%	14/64.29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	591/70%	505/74%	260/85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	405/64%	354/66%	181/84%
	Students With Disabilities	64/31%	56/50%	28/79%
	English Language Learners	60/67%	53/57%	27/86%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**
SWD	43	57	64	40	50	50	46				
ELL	54	83		43	58		73				
ASN	80			60							
BLK	58			33							
HSP	58	76		45	48		52				
MUL	53	50		71	60						
WHT	72	69	71	65	59	41	73				
FRL	61	62	52	50	50	33	58				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	59
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that are emerging across grade levels is below proficiency in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, our SWD subgroup is making gains in all areas and our AA subgroup is performing below 40% in math, math learning gains and science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Learning Gains at 55%, Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains at 37%, and ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains at 58%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

High mobility of students, scheduling restrictions, loss of math instruction due to quarantining and learning options.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement based on 2019 state assessments were the ELA components; ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains and ELA LQ Learning Gains. ELA Achievement increased from 60% to 67%; an increase of 7%, ELA Learning Gains increased from 59% to 68%; an increase of 9%, and ELA LQ Learning Gains increased from 48% to 58%; an increase of 10%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

New actions that contributed to this improvement was the implementation of intervention teachers for ELA targeting our lowest quartile students. We increased data tracking through PLC for our lowest quartile students through using classroom assessments and iReady lessons.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies that need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are continuation of targeting our lowest quartile students and tracking their data. Implementation of targeted intervention groups.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities that will be provided at our school to support teachers and leaders are further training in Benchmark Advance focusing teacher clarity. We will also provide professional development focused on teacher need and input in an unconference style.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond will include implementing evidence based strategies based on identified needs of our students. A strong implementation of overall safety and supportiveness of learning environments will be monitored to help all students achieve. We will work as a team to communicate goals and action steps necessary to reach our goals and as we move through implementation we will continue to analyze data, identify gaps and adjust our strategies fitting the needs of our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. 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 our teachers will using the Responsive Classroom approach.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through quarterly Responsive Classroom walk-throughs and data chats to reflect on the achievement of the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Harris (eaharris@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	
Conduct training in PBIS and Responsive Classroom Social Emotional Learning Expectations.	
Person Responsible	Erica Harris (eaharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.	
Person Responsible	Erica Harris (eaharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Quarterly Responsive Classroom data chats.	
Person Responsible	Erica Harris (eaharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
All staff will receive ongoing SEL, Responsive Classroom training throughout the school year.	
Person Responsible	Erica Harris (eaharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is aligned to the Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were at 37%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in order to improve proficiency for our math lowest quartile students. Further analysis revealed that the our Lowest Quartile students were also included in our targeted ESSA Subgroup: SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 37% to 41%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through monthly growth monitoring, data chats through PLC to determine instructional adjustments, walk throughs for fidelity of intervention block, and coaching cycles based on teacher and student need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is targeted systematic 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	Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Utilize initial diagnostic data to plan for math intervention for lowest quartile	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
PL with math intervention (iReady lessons)	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data and identify lowest quartile students.	
Person Responsible	Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Professional Learning will be provided to teachers to train teachers on Response to Intervention using iReady lessons for math intervention.	
Person Responsible	Timothy Martin (trmartin@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)

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	Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is aligned to the Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Lowest Quartile Learning gains was at 58%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 58% to 62%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthough tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles based on teacher need will be utilized.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of.84 (Hattie, 2021). The average affect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .84 it is likely the impact on students is significantly greater than the average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: -have appropriately high expectations. -share their notions of success criteria with their students. -ensure there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task and the assignment. -ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and -provide welcome feedback about where to move next.

Action Steps to Implement	
The 6 ELA expectations that are embedded in BEST Standards are posted in each classroom.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Every classroom will include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Williams (jpwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide

worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students. Coach Stephanie Lalashuis Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

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

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Timothy Martin (trmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school data shows a high level of students with disabilities receiving out of school suspension and in school suspension. Our school focus will be reducing the frequency of out of school and in school suspensions with our SWD by implementing the following:

School will:
Train in Responsive Classroom
Conduct Responsive Classroom teacher walkthroughs
Analyze and share discipline data with faculty quarterly

Teacher will:
Implement Responsive Classroom
Implement clear expectations and procedures to solve conflicts
Provide a calm down space for all students to use in class as necessary

Quarterly Discipline Data meetings will take place with the faculty to discuss our plan and make adjustments.

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.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The stakeholders responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment will be our school administrators, SEL TOA, school counselors, and SAC members. The role of these stakeholders will be ensuring SEL is built into the day through Responsive Classroom in all classrooms by conducting Responsive Classroom walk-throughs. Stakeholders will also ensure the use of PBIS and meet monthly to discuss and analyze the culture and environment through discipline data. Data will be shared and discussed throughout the year at SAC meetings.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00