

Citrus County Schools

Pleasant Grove Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

630 PLEASANT GROVE RD, Inverness, FL 34452

<https://pge.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Rob Hermann

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

630 PLEASANT GROVE RD, Inverness, FL 34452

<https://pge.citruschools.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

Yes

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

69%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

15%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2018-19
B

2017-18
B

2016-17
C

2015-16
B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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

Within our four strong wall at PGE, we strive as companions to nurture excellence, celebrate the worth of each person, foster respect for one another and promote never ending learning.

Provide the school's vision statement

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tuggle, Janet	Principal	
Varnadore, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Alligood, Jerrica	Instructional Coach	
Schultz, Samantha	Guidance Counselor	
Babyak, Holly	Other	ESE Specialist
Boynton, Leanna	Other	Media Specialist

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	110	125	105	84	110	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	34	16	14	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	59%	57%	66%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	54%	50%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	53%	44%	41%	48%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	63%	70%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains	49%	54%	62%	62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	39%	51%	46%	39%	47%
Science Achievement	61%	60%	53%	58%	61%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	110 (0)	125 (0)	105 (0)	84 (0)	110 (0)	106 (0)	640 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	34 ()	16 ()	14 ()	7 ()	11 ()	15 ()	97 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	3 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	16 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	15 (0)	22 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
	2018	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	68%	58%	10%	56%	12%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	58%	14%	62%	10%
	2018	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	59%	11%	64%	6%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	58%	4%	53%	9%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	61	53	48	52	36	27				
ELL	80			70							
BLK	50			40							
HSP	86	70		86	30						
MUL	50			75							
WHT	70	58	46	69	51	33	63				
FRL	65	55	39	67	50	33	61				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	42	41	36	50	38	21				
HSP	81	60		81	80						
MUL	75	64		58	70						
WHT	67	54	52	71	61	48	61				
FRL	61	50	45	67	58	43	55				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45

Black/African American Students	
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	68
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
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
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	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Our math learning gains for the bottom quartile showed the lowest performance. We had several new teachers at the 4th grade level this year. There were also instructional holes in the area of math interventions.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was math learning gains for the overall student population. We had several new teachers at the 4th grade level this year. There were also instructional holes in the area of math interventions.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

African American/Black and Students with Disabilities performed with the greatest gap compared to the state average. We had lost one interventionist this year, and ESE teachers did not provide specific strategies on students' weaknesses. Rather, they provided more accommodations and supplementary instruction.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

5th grade ELA showed the most improvement this year. We had two teachers loop with their students, as well as a full-time ESE teacher and ESE aide for that grade level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

15% of our students had chronic absences this year (more than 10% of school year).

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

1. ELA Gains
2. Math Gains
3. Attendance
4. Discipline
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Monitor the ELA academic progress of our lowest 25%
Rationale	<p>Although our ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile have slightly improved, the data within our subgroups indicate a need for monitoring.</p> <p>ELA Learning Gains of Bottom Quartile: 45%</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile will increase by 5% during 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Janet Tuggle (tugglej@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of iReady.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Citrus County School District adopted a research based, supplemental intervention curriculum. By using this curriculum to fidelity, we will increase the instructional rigor for our bottom quartile students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will complete 45 minutes per week of the iReady online platform. 2. Monthly student progress monitoring completed by classroom teacher and grade level chairperson. 3. Utilize Instructional Coach in the understanding and implementation of the curriculum. 4. Instructional Coach will model effective instruction, identifying systematic patterns of student need, participation in the design and development of professional development. 5. Monthly data review meetings with Principal and Instructional Coach.
Person Responsible	Janet Tuggle (tugglej@citrusschools.org)

#2	
Title	Monitor the Math academic progress of our lowest 25%
Rationale	Although the over Math Achievement only dropped 1%, however, the Math learning gains dropped significantly. The overall Math Learning Gains in 2018 were 62% and in 2019 49%. The Math Learning Gains of the lowest quartile in 2018 were 46% and 31% in 2019. Math Learning Gains of Bottom Quartile: 31%

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Math learning gains of the bottom quartile will increase by 5% during 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of iReady.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Citrus County School District adopted a research based, supplemental intervention curriculum. By using this curriculum to fidelity, we will increase the instructional rigor for our bottom quartile students.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will complete 45 minutes per week of the iReady online platform. 2. Monthly student progress monitoring completed by classroom teacher and grade level chairperson. 3. Utilize Instructional Coach in the understanding and implementation of the curriculum. 4. Instructional Coach will model effective instruction, identifying systematic patterns of student need, participation in the design and development of professional development. 5. Monthly data review meetings with Principal and Instructional Coach.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Attendance: We will promote the importance of students attending school "all day, every day" to families and other community stakeholders by building relationships, educating families, and reinforcing to all stakeholders the value of education.

Discipline: We will decrease discipline referrals to further reduce referrals and continue in creating a safe environment for learning, meeting the social/emotional needs of all students through a positive school-wide culture. By implementing Conscious Discipline, teachers can better understand students' emotional needs and use other research-based strategies for

equipping students with the tools they need to succeed. Sanford Harmony will enable classroom teachers to build a caring climate and teach needed social skills for all students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Through our stakeholder surveys we saw that parents/guardians prefer communication through Class Dojo notifications, email, phone calls and classroom/school monthly newsletters. By increasing these modes of communication we plan to build positive relationships with our families and support the needs of our students.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Guidance Counselor - small group and one-on-one counseling sessions, character education lessons, deescalation strategies

Social Worker - small group and one-on-one counseling sessions, family resources, home visits, supports classroom teachers in social-emotional needs in the classroom

School Psychologist - provided for supports, as needed

Whole School - Sanford Harmony "Meet Up, Buddy Up", Kindness Crew (paring at risk student with staff member for positive, daily interactions), character development curriculum for first grade students

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The fifth grade students participate in middle school orientation. This is conducted during the school day so that no child is left out of the process.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

- Leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach, ESE specialist, and school counselor meet every Monday morning

- Monthly data day meetings held by principal to review grade-level scores with each grade-level team; these days are also held for teachers to coordinate planning, monitor student progress and share intervention strategies
- Curriculum nights held to involve and inform parents
- Interventionist teachers utilized to work with Tier 3 students in small groups as well as support Tier 2 as needed to support student progress
- ESE specialist meets regularly with ESE teachers to review their lesson plans and review data.
- Positive Behavior Support meetings held monthly to support discipline and positive behavior.
- RTI meetings for struggling students held as needed to review data and discuss strategies/ services to meet student needs
- Instructional coach works with teachers on implementation of interventions and iReady and Ready LAFS and MAFS curriculum. Focusing on new teachers, 4th and 5th grade teachers and developing understand of all elements of the curriculum.
- Teachers will review iReady data on a weekly basis. Administrators will review iReady data on a monthly basis.
- District TOSAs utilized as needed to meet with staff in areas of ELA, math, science, social studies, and technology integration.
- 3rd-5th grade teachers of 1:1 device classrooms use digital resources such as Study Island, BrainPop, E-Backpack, etc.
- Accelerated Reader to increase motivation to read

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Various grade levels offer "career day" type events throughout the year. School wide competitions themed around college/university school spirit.