

Volusia County Schools

Citrus Grove Elementary School



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (47%)
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	ATSI
* 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eagles do their best and nothing less!

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Jennifer	Principal	Administrative walkthroughs and feedback to teachers and staff. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings. Review data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention, ESE and ELL support. Monitor Responsive Classroom practices through ongoing administrative walkthroughs.
Harris, Erica	Assistant Principal	Administrative walkthroughs and feedback to teachers and staff. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings. Review data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention, ESE and ELL support. Monitor Responsive Classroom practices through ongoing administrative walkthroughs. Provide assistance with EWS information and quarterly EWS/discipline meetings. Responsible for updating SIP information and uploading to the CIMS site. Lead Stocktake process. AVID Site 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 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. Responsible for updating SIP information and uploading to the CIMS site.
Hutchinson, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice. Attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magras, Olivia	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice. Attend SLT meetings, and provide input on School Improvement Plan and professional learning.
Copes, Dana	School Counselor	Attend SLT Meetings and facilitate PBIS team meetings. Teacher support for SEL SIP goal, and student lessons.
Martello, Frank	Assistant Principal	Ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and 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 support. Monitor Responsive Classroom Practices through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Jennifer Williams P

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

821

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	150	137	132	135	151	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	847
Attendance below 90 percent	37	31	29	35	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	5	6	6	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	13	26	12	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	6	7	13	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	0	1	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

Friday 6/3/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	53%	56%				60%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						48%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	42%	50%				60%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						53%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						53%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	55%	59%				62%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	59%	5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	32	43	44	30	41	30	37				
ELL	45	50	33	47	50	13	50				
ASN	80	82		85	73						
BLK	51	67		35	46	50	30				
HSP	49	53	33	50	48	24	66				
MUL	50	70		63	70						
WHT	64	62	59	60	56	36	70				
FRL	55	59	43	49	51	31	54				

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				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 are performance below proficiency in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. Our SWD ESSA Subgroup achievement has decreased in ELA Achievement by 11%, Math Achievement by 10%, and Science Achievement by 9%. Science achievement remained the same from 2021-2022 at an achievement of 66%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains at 34% and ELA Lowest Quartile Learning gains at 49%.

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

Contributing factors for our need of improvement would include scheduling restrictions, loss of math instruction creating gaps in learning and new ELA standards and curriculum.

New action steps that need to be taken would be the use of collaborative planning within grade level PLC's, continued PL on new standards and curriculum.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement based on iReady was specific to 2nd grade ELA overall students meeting mid or above grade level improved from 44% to 48%, Math also increased from 33% to 37%. 4th Grade Math increased 35% to 43%.

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

2nd grade had increased support provided by the intervention teacher and reading coach during the intervention and literacy block. 4th grade collaboratively regularly as a team.

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 the following data: iReady (3-5), FAST Assessments 1,2 & 3 (K-5) and Ongoing Classroom Progress Monitoring Assessments (VPAS, QPA, Fluency & Unit Assessments).

MTSS training and 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 training on Big Ideas and MTSS.

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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 34%. 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:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

41% of our Math Lowest Quartile Students will make sufficient progress from State PM1 to State PM3.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the 3 State Progress Monitoring checks, 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:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75 (Hattie, 2021). The average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .75 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.
- provide welcome feedback about where to move next.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Timothy Martin (trmartin@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 Erica Harris (eaharris@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 Tim Martin and grade level 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 Timothy Martin (trmartin@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)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

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

Monitor math instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 49%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that the our Lowest Quartile students were also included in our targeted ESSA Subgroup: SWD that performed below 41% at 32%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

54% of our ELA Lowest Quartile Students will make sufficient progress from State PM1 to State PM3.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through the 3 State Progress Monitoring checks, frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth, walk throughs for fidelity of intervention block, and coaching cycles based on teacher and student need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is targeted systematic response to intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Response to Intervention has a 1.29 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review ELA Data (iReady (3-5) Diagnostic 1, FAST Assessments 1 (K-5) and Ongoing Classroom Progress Monitoring Assessments (VPAS, QPA, & Fluency) to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ELL Para Support.

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

Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data and identify lowest quartile students in 3rd.

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

Professional Learning will be provided to instructional staff on MTSS.

Person Responsible Dana Copes (djcopies@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 Stephanie Lalashuis (salalash@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

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

Monitor ELA interventions through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.

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

Collaborative Planning will take place weekly in PLC's in all grade levels.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

100% of our teachers will using the Responsive Classroom approach.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Responsive Classroom, a student-centered, social and emotional learning approach to teaching and discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for

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

selecting this strategy. 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct training in PBIS and Responsive Classroom Social Emotional Learning Expectations.

Person Responsible Dana Copes (djcopies@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 Dana Copes (djcopies@volusia.k12.fl.us)

All staff will receive ongoing PBIS, Responsive Classroom training throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Dana Copes (djcopies@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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.