

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Citrus Grove K 8 Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Citrus Grove K 8 Center

2121 NW 5TH ST, Miami, FL 33125

<http://citrusgrove.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Savigne D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	93%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 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 Dade 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Citrus Grove K 8 Center

2121 NW 5TH ST, Miami, FL 33125

<http://citrusgrove.dadeschools.net/>

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

Citrus Grove Elementary School's mission is to work with the community to provide students with a quality education that focuses on values and academic achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Citrus Grove Elementary is committed to providing Educational Excellence for all.

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
Savigne, Jennifer	Principal	As the instructional leader, the principal directs and manages the instructional program utilizing data driven decisions to ensure the academic success of all students. The principal provides a clear vision and mission to all faculty, staff, and students by working towards improving the teaching and learning at the school. The power of teacher leaders is unmeasurable; therefore, cultivating leadership in others is fundamental to the position. The principal oversees compliance with district policies and operation of the campus.
Rodriguez, Maria	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision, and management of the school program with an emphasis on curriculum and instruction. The assistant principal serves as the MTSS Coordinator responsible for implementing and monitoring a three-tiered program and behavioral interventions. The assistant principal is a resource to teachers, supports students, responds to parents, and assists in the managing of the daily school operations.
Mejia, Miguel	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach works with teachers to enhance classroom learning, implementing best teaching practices, developing curricular plans with teachers, and monitoring student progress. Ensuring fidelity to the implementation of interventions and monitoring of student progress is central to the job responsibilities of the Reading Coach.
Fernandez, Sonia	Math Coach	The Math Coach develops curricular plans with teachers, models best teaching strategies, and supports the mathematics instructional program at the school. The Math Coach provides support with math assessments and interventions.
Abril, Marjorie	Teacher, PreK	The teacher is responsible for preparing and delivering lessons to engage and educate young children. Their duties include, establishing and enforcing rules of behavior, adapting teaching methods and materials to meet interest and learning styles, and develop positive relationships with students and parents.
Lopez, Ivette	Teacher, ESE	The Program Specialist is responsible for providing support to teachers with regards to the education of students with disabilities. The Program Specialist will serve as the school's Local Education Agency (LEA) representative for IEP meetings. The duties include, scheduling parent conferences, re-evaluations, assist with onsite inservice training, and ensures compliance with district and state guidelines.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, Jennifer Savigne D

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.*

11

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.*

47

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Total number of students enrolled at the school

748

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.

0

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	66	99	109	161	104	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	12	39	40	52	15	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	38	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	27	6	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	36	76	115	48	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358

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	3	42	5	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	107	125	136	148	173	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	38	41	42	26	45	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	15	27	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	26	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	3	12	34	33	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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				44%	63%	61%	47%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	61%	59%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	57%	54%	61%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				57%	67%	62%	54%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				62%	63%	59%	59%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	56%	52%	48%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				34%	56%	56%	52%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					80%	78%		79%	77%

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	36%	60%	-24%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	64%	-26%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	34%	60%	-26%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2021					
		-38%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	69%	-17%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	65%	-19%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	53%	-25%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The Progress Monitoring Tool utilized to assess students' academic performance in Fall, Winter, and Spring was the I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment. I-Ready was utilized in Kindergarten through fifth grade.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28.3	39.1	31.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.3	38.6	31.8
	Students With Disabilities	31.6	26.3	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	18.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19.6	29.4	26.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.3	28.4	26.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	18.8
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.5	29.0	30.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.8	28.3	30.2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17.8	34.6	35.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.0	34.9	34.9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28.3	35.8	40.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.6	36.2	41.4
	Students With Disabilities	0	21.4	0
	English Language Learners	0	13.3	16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11.7	26.7	29.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.1	26.7	29.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	13.3	15.0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17.9	20.7	23.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4	21.7	23.2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14.5	22.1	31.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.8	21.7	31.2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	7.4	16.1	24.7

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19.2	28.3	25.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.7	29.1	26.5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16.7	27.5	35.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.1	28.2	35.9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	20.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		15.3	
	Economically Disadvantaged		15.7	
	Students With Disabilities		0	
	English Language Learners		0	

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	35	30	24	35	38	27	34				
ELL	33	42	33	25	19	14	24				
BLK	23			25							
HSP	37	39	32	29	20	17	24				
FRL	37	39	34	28	19	13	26				
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	41	54	46	56	67	47	31				
ELL	40	56	50	54	60	45	32				
BLK	58			79							
HSP	43	57	51	55	62	50	34				
FRL	44	58	52	58	62	52	34				

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	41	57	52	47	51	46	36				
ELL	37	59	62	48	56	51	23				
HSP	47	64	62	54	60	51	52				
FRL	48	63	60	54	60	49	52				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

2019 data findings:

The three year trend data denotes minimal improvement in ELA proficiency: 30% in 2017, 36% in 2018, and 36% in 2019.

The ELL Subgroup ELA Proficiency is significantly below the ED and ESE subgroup (19% ELL, 44% ED, & 40% ESE).

The ELA Learning Gains performance denotes the ELL Subgroup performed at least 7 percentage points below the ED and ESE subgroups.

The ELL Math Proficiency data shows the ELL subgroup performing at least 16 percentage points below the ED and ESE subgroups (38% ELL, 58% ED, and 54% ESE).

2021 data findings:

The 2021 FSA ELA School-wide Proficiency results demonstrated a 6 percentage point decline from 36% to 30% as compared to the 2019 FSA ELA results.

The 2021 FSA Mathematics School-wide Proficiency results demonstrated a 29 percentage point decline from 51% to 22% as compared to the 2019 FSA Mathematics results.

The 2021 Statewide Science Assessment Proficiency results declined 6 percentage points from 28% in 2019 to 22% in 2021.

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

The 2021 results revealed significant decreases in reading and math learning gains, with a total loss of 106 percentage points combined.

The 2019 data denotes the ELL Subgroup was the lowest performing subgroup in ELA Learning Gains.

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

ELL students lack English language proficiency that affects performance on state assessments.

There is a need to increase support to ELL students and provide opportunities that increase literacy skills in English. In order to fully support this initiative, there is a need to adjust the master schedule so that ELL students receive additional support in the classroom.

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

ELA Learning Gains in third grade is 79% whereas the district show 77%.

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

The school offers an Intensive Acceleration course to all at-risk third grade students. The school will increase the number of Intensive Acceleration courses to accommodate low performing students.

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

There are several strategies which are essential to accelerate learning. Data-driven planning will be used to tailor instruction to meet student needs. To lessen the gap, Differentiated Instruction will be used to address learner deficiencies. The administrators will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers to provide collaborative discourse among instructional staff on addressing standard deficiencies.

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 Learning opportunities will be offered via collaborative planning, faculty meetings, and during the professional development days at the school site. Professional Development include:
Social Emotional Learning (August 2021)
ESOL Strategies (August 2021 and October 2021)
STEAM for Student Engagement (August 2021)
Unpacking Standards (ongoing)
Differentiated Instruction (ongoing)

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

The Leadership Team will continue to support teachers by providing push-in support, opportunities for observing peer teachers and instructional coaches modeling best practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2021 English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) denoted a seven percentage point decrease in proficiency from 44% in 2019 compared to 37% in 2021. The school three-year trend data of the FSA ELA Proficiency shows minimal or no growth from 30% in 2017 to 36% in 2018 and 2019.

Measurable Outcome: If we provide interventions and small group instruction, the reading proficiency will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessment.

Monitoring: The administrators will conduct walkthroughs during intervention and small group instruction and provide appropriate feedback to teachers and coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing data chats after assessments will provide opportunities to analyze data and develop a strategic plan that will improve learning outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data Conversations will allow teachers to reflect on their data, set goals and develop a plan which, in turn, will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

8/23-10/11-In order to support standards based instruction, the teacher and the coach will examine standards discussing essential understanding and use of assessments during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Utilizing the Coach Teacher Collaboration model, lessons will be created collaboratively using best practices, differentiation, technology and lessons will be modeled by coaches.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Administrators will meet with teachers after every Reading Diagnostic to discuss instructional practices and action plan.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Instructional coaches will meet on a weekly basis with the leadership team to collaborate on pre-set goals and fostering teacher leadership/capacity.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Teachers will incorporate graphic organizers to scaffold instruction and increase reading comprehension.

Person Responsible Miguel Mejia (mmejia786@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Teachers will incorporate Marzano's strategies to teach and build vocabulary.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-Continue utilizing the Coach Teacher Collaboration model to make instructional coaching more empowering for teachers in order to increase ELA student achievement

Person Responsible [no one identified]

2/1-4/30-Continue utilizing the Coach Teacher Collaboration model to make instructional coaching more empowering for teachers in order to increase ELA student achievement

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-Continue incorporating graphic organizers to increase reading comprehension and Marzano's strategies to teach and build vocabulary.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on Florida Standards Assessment, there was significant learning loss in Reading and Mathematics. Differentiation will maximize student learning growth and individual success by providing tailored instruction that meet individual needs.

Measurable Outcome: If we implement Differentiation with fidelity, then our students will increase by a minimum of 7 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring through the use of data trackers will serve as a means to see how well students are learning material. Data from formative assessments will allow administrators to monitor student progress and teachers to plan and provide personalized instruction that ensures students get the academic support they need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data from formative assessments will identify student learning gaps and allow the teacher to provide differentiation and proper scaffolding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Being data literate allows teachers to adjust instruction based on student performance. As new data becomes available, flexible and fluid grouping is pivotal to closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

8/23-10/11-During collaborative planning sessions, coaches and teachers will analyze school data to group students based on their needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Provide support to teachers by modeling D.I. implementation through Coach Teacher Collaboration and planning sessions.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-The administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Conduct collaborative data chats to determine whether to intensify or modify strategies to meet the broad needs of the entire class.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-During collaborative planning, gather and review enrichment resources for proficient level students.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Establish internal monitoring system to track student progress to determine effectiveness differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-During collaborative planning, utilize student analysis report to identify reasons for lowest standard on assessments and reteach during DI lessons.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-Administration will continue conducting walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2021 SIP Culture Student Attendance data revealed a 3-year trend of increasing student absences in subcategories of 16 or more absences. The data shows that the percentage of students with 16-30 absences increased from 17% to 27% during 2019 to 2021. There was also an increase within the subcategory of students with more than 31 absences increasing from 6% to 16% during 2019 to 2021. The 10-percentage point increase in excessive student absences demonstrates a critical need to improve student attendance at the school site. Regular student attendance is pivotal in influencing academic success. Excessive absences hinder students' abilities to keep up with daily lessons and assignments which more than likely will negatively affect student learning and achievement.

Measurable Outcome: If we intervene early and connect with the at-risk students the attendance for students with excessive absences will decrease by 20 percent.

Monitoring: The Attendance Team will communicate attendance expectations and track students with habitual truancy weekly. Early identification and intervention will be provided to students. Incentives and rewards will be given weekly to students with perfect attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school is committed to increasing attendance and keeping students engaged in school; therefore, a clear attendance policy, early identification of truant students, targeted interventions and a personal connection with students and families are strategies that will increase attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Daily attendance has a direct correlation to increasing student achievement and growth.

Action Steps to Implement

8/23-10-11-To provide personalized outreach, the attendance committee members will contact parents of students with absent trends on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-The School Counselor will connect with at-risk students via with small groups or individually to provide support and encouragement through counseling sessions.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Monitor attendance data and practices to examine if supports to chronically absent students are appropriate.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Recognize good or improved attendance by recognizing individual students, rewards for students with excellent attendance or improved attendance from at-risk groups (weekly and monthly).

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Educate and engage families about the importance of attendance via parent in-service provided by the Community Involvement Specialist.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Utilize internal management system to collect, track, and monitor attendance progress.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-Continue to utilize internal management system to collect, track, and monitor attendance progress.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/40 Continue rewarding good or improved attendance of individual students with rewards weekly and/or monthly.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Walkthroughs help gauge school climate and teachers' instructional practices. The 2021 school wide proficiency in ELA Reading declined 6 percentage points from the previous state assessment and according to the trend data is stagnant (36%, 36%, 30%). The Mathematics proficiency declined 29 percentage points from 51% to 22%;therefore, there is a need to have a process for feedback and reflection based on observations.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement walk-throughs and provide feedback with fidelity then, instructional practices will improve and student achievement will increase by 10 percentage points as evidence by the 2022 State Assessment.

Monitoring: The administration will maintain a walkthrough log to ensure fidelity of a collaborative process through feedback that will promote optimal learning outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the targeted area of walk-throughs, our school will utilize the evidence-based strategy Consistent Developmental Feedback to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional walk-through cycles will provide valuable information that will aid in improving classroom practices and instruction in order to meet the needs of all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

8/23-10/11-The Leadership Team will meet weekly to establish goals and purpose of walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-The administration will build in at least 20 minutes of short walkthroughs observations daily to establish a culture of collaboration and feedback to improve the teaching process.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-Provide teachers with meaningful feedback that encourages dialogue and growth.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

8/23-10/11-When conducting walkthroughs record "highlights" of solid instructional practices to share at faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Conduct walkthrough weekly to monitor the implementation of instructional shifts.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (mariayrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-During Leader Team meeting discuss instructional practices observed and professional growth opportunities need for job-embedded professional development.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-The administration will continue short classroom walkthrough observations daily to monitor teaching practices within the classroom and share examples of solid instructional practices at faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

2/1-4/30-Administration will provide meaningful feedback to teachers specifically relating to walkthroughs in an effort to improve the teaching process.

Person Responsible Jennifer Savigne (pr0801@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Discipline is vital to a healthy school culture and social setting for students. In order to develop a more robust behavioral support system, Citrus Grove Elementary will continue with planning mindfulness sessions to improve attitudes and well being. During the 2019 school year the occurrence of minor referrals for non-compliance was at 4% for one referral and 0.71% for two or more referrals. Citrus Grove Elementary School reported 1.0 incidents per 100 students which is less than the Statewide Elementary School rate.

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.

A positive school culture and environment are fostered and addressed via collaborative experiences that allow teachers to interact in an informal setting such as with "Coffee Club Fridays." Teachers who have provided feedback on this initiative have indicated this has been a positive experience for them, as it has enhanced the feeling of community among faculty and staff members. Additionally, a motivational thought is displayed at the coffee station for reflection and to start the day with a positive mindset. Team building activities are embedded in school wide professional development opportunities to cultivate comradery amongst staff members. Staff and students are provided opportunities to give feedback to the School's Leadership team as it relates to engagement in the classroom and schoolwide activities.

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

The School Leadership Team, comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, and Counselors play a pivotal role in building a positive school culture and environment. For example, the principal takes a hands-on approach to boost morale throughout the school and oversee that the school’s initiatives are being carried out with fidelity. The leadership team along with staff, students, and faculty have come together to work on the shared goal of beautifying the landscape of the school and contributing to the school’s garden. This collaborative effort has instilled a sense of pride and ownership over the school’s cleanliness and transformation.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00