School District of Osceola County, FL

Central Avenue Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nadia Winston

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Osceola 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

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	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	91%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Central Avenue Elementary School: Ensuring high levels of learning for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Central Avenue is a safe place where staff, students, and community members feel included as part of the school. We will ensure success for all by communicating and collaborating effectively to identify and meet the needs of the whole child while providing a positive and engaging environment, working toward high expectations set 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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeRight, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Amanda DeRight is responsible for the school stocktake, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback to the principal as well as facilitate the meeting process. Her responsibilities include observing and supporting instructional coaches and instructional staff members throughout the school, monitoring progress of students as per Tier I instruction, monitoring and acting on student data per school wide data analyzing, and providing supports where needed.
Derstine, Brandi	Instructional Technology	Brandi Derstine is the technology integration coach. She specifically oversee's any technology that is being implemented into our instruction. Our 3-5 teachers have 1-to-1 devices so she ensures that our teachers are using that technology in order to impact student achievement. More specifically, she helps the teachers use their LSI trackers in order to track student progress. She gives trainings throughout the year and also ensures that the Leadership Team is using our Growth Tracker and Trend Tracker (both part of the LSI Trackers) to perform our walkthroughs and "Look and Learns." This all helps teachers implement the specific LSI Techniques and then also be tracked by the Leadership Team to guide our coaching. Ms. Derstine also coaches 3-4 teachers every 2 weeks on the most recent instructional technique from our LSI work using the "Plan, Do, Observe, Act" coaching model.
Winston, Nadia	Principal	The principal (Nadia Winston) and the assistant principal (Amanda DeRight) are both responsible for the school stocktake, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback. Both administrators also coach 2-3 teachers every 2 weeks on the most recent instructional technique from our LSI work using the "Plan, Do, Observe, Act" coaching model. In addition, we provide feedback on the evaluation tool in a timely manner to inform instruction and in turn, positively effect teaching and learning.
Kowalski, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Melissa Kowalski if our Math/Science Coach. Her specific responsibilities include but are not limited to overseeing math and science instruction throughout the whole school. She attends PLC's twice per week to ensure that teachers have the correct resources and are using appropriate strategies depending on their learning target and success criteria for the particular lessons they are planning. She also created the curriculum for the STEM Lab that is on the block wheel for kindergarten through fifth grade. This is to ensure science competency in all grades and ultimately ensure that when our 5th graders take the Science FCAT test they are proficient. Mrs. Kowalski also coaches 3-4 teachers every 2 weeks on the most recent instructional technique from our LSI work using the "Plan, Do, Observe, Act" coaching model.
Kincade, Sabrina	Instructional Coach	Sabrina Kincade is our Behavior Coach. Her specific responsibilities include but are not limited to overseeing the PBIS process school wide. She ensures that expectations are explicitly taught and are posted throughout the school in the appropriate areas. She also ensures that Zones of Regulation is explicitly taught to ensure that students become aware of their feelings and can calm down before the commit an act against the Student Code of Conduct. She

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		also leads the 3 self-contained EBD units to make sure that grade level instruction is being taught and the environment in each of these classrooms is conducive to learning. She also performs walkthroughs to help coach teachers on specific management strategies to ensure optimal instruction at all times. Mrs. Kincade also coaches 3-4 teachers every 2 weeks on the most recent instructional technique from our LSI work using the "Plan, Do, Observe, Act" coaching model.
Matos, Marla	Instructional Coach	Ms. Matos is the English for Speakers of Other Languages specialist at Central. Her duties are to maintain compliance with all students with limited English proficiency designations and to maintain assessment standards for students in this program and services provided to students to access and learn the English language. Ms. Matos also provides instructional staff members with the needed tools and resources to support the English Language learners within the academic areas. Ms. Matos is the owner of the Focus area related to English Language Learners.
Phillips, Karen	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Phillips works to structure and maintain systems related to the MTSS process and intervention programs school wide. Mrs. Phillips oversees supplemental resources and intervention processes as well as facilitates meetings and processes related to the progress monitoring of students within each Tier, as well as communications with parents and other stakeholders throughout the monitoring processes.
Wittko, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Wittko is the Literacy Coach at Central. She is responsible for overseeing the school wide literacy plan as well as the literacy leadership team for the school. Mrs. Wittko is responsible for providing resources to instructional staff members in the area of literacy, as well as providing support to instructional staff members, students and parents in the area of literacy. Support includes facilitation of professional development, providing resources and providing support to students as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/29/2018, Nadia Winston

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.*
3

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	82	71	105	87	74	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
One or more suspensions	10	1	1	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	1	2	4	7	21	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/2/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	92	121	118	92	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	19	37	20	18	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	9	13	34	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	1	11	27	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	92	121	118	92	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	19	37	20	18	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	9	13	34	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	1	11	27	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	34%	53%	57%	39%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	51%	53%	78%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	55%	63%	52%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	59%	62%	58%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	51%	45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	49%	53%	47%	54%	51%

		EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%	
	2018	26%	51%	-25%	57%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%	
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	56%	-26%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2019	28%	48%	-20%	56%	-28%	
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%	
Same Grade Comparison		-11%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%	
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	62%	-32%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	35%	53%	-18%	64%	-29%	
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	62%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison		5%					
05	2019	39%	48%	-9%	60%	-21%	
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	61%	-17%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		-10%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	30%	45%	-15%	53%	-23%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	-19%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	50	50	37	45	39	7				
ELL	23	52	60	44	44	35	30				
BLK	33	45		37	52		36				
HSP	32	55	61	49	45	30	38				
WHT	53	55		65	60						
FRL	31	49	57	46	49	44	33				

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	26	42	42	37	55	50					
ELL	26	53	63	37	60	55	32				
BLK	49	54		53	70		69				
HSP	37	57	59	40	57	58	48				
WHT	26	50		58	54						
FRL	37	55	57	46	63	63	54				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	4	69	75	24	47						
ELL	29	57	83	46	55	57	30				
BLK	34	41		45	40						
HSP	38	56	85	49	59	52	42				
WHT	47	70		67	70						
FRL	38	53	78	49	55	43	41				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	43
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.

In general, ELA is the lowest proficiency data component at 34% achievement. The two subgroups are SWD 17% and ELL 23% proficient. Targeted support for the identified subgroups was lacking due to inadequate planning for instruction. There was also a lack of understanding in how to support the needs of students to fill foundational gaps.

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

5th grade in all academic areas showed the greatest decline from the prior year. ELA dropped 11%, Math 5% and Science 19%. A contributing factor to the decline is a lack of analyzing data to determine the differentiated instruction needed to enhance and support student achievement.

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.

4th grade ELA had the greatest gap compared to the state average at -34%. The need for focused writing instruction would allow students to better plan for responses when faced with a writing task.

Additionally, the specific needs of students need to be further identified through data analysis to include foundational instruction.

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

Our ELA LQ increased 4%, with 3rd Grade ELA achievement increase of 6%. The Math achievement increased 1%, with 3rd Grade Math achievement increase of 17%. There were Portfolio Focused lessons that year that was structured throughout the year as standards were taught. Our school also implemented a math CIM schedule to review standards and help with test taking strategies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students exhibiting two or more indicators on the EWS, were higher in 4th and 5th grade which was where our largest drop and greatest gaps were.

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

1. Focus on achievement through evidence of growth for all
2. Systems of supports for students, staff, and parents
3. Opportunities for students to have time on task across all content areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 Central Avenue had one sub groups below the ESSA level 41 %. This effected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA Data for 2018-2019 ESE - 33% will increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process - how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, and ELLEVATION training.
5. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

Person Responsible Karen Phillips (karen.phillips@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows for ELA 34% of students in grades 3-5 are reading at proficient levels as measured on FSA. Currently, students in grades 3-5 are 23 points below state level in proficiency. By providing students with more time on task in reading and writing, students will be able to increase reading levels and improve student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase by 10% from 34% to 44% on the state exam. Each subgroup will show a year and a half worth of growth in ELA as measured by the NWEA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that if students are engaged in time on task their reading achievement will approve. Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003) /, 47

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy. Best practices will be grounded in LSI and AVID as well as a focus on Guided Reading.

Person Responsible	Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)

2. Implement a balanced literacy block that includes content-relevant strategies through whole group, differentiated small group, and independent time.

Person Responsible	Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers document and monitor student evidence of learning via LSI tracker.
4. PLC teams will analyze evidence of student learning to ensure a correlation among all progress monitoring data and adjust instruction to meet the needs of the students.
5. Teachers and students will use accurate progress monitoring data to set goals during one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

Person Responsible	Brandi Derstine (brandi.derstine@osceolaschools.net)

6. Students (including all subgroups) will be trained on strategies to select and utilize across content areas during independent work time. For example, ELL students will have access to education tools and strategies that will help them enhance their performance and mastery of the grade standard.
7. Teachers will be trained on different ESOL strategies and programs that will enhance the academic engagement of ELL students.

8. Instructional staff will purposefully plan for ESE and ELL strategies based on data gathered through formal and informal assessments as evidenced by planning, instruction, and classroom visits

Person Responsible   Marla Matos (marla.matos@osceolaschools.net)

9. Instructional staff will implement targeted, tiered interventions using varied, research-based instructional strategies to improve literacy proficiency of all students as identified by the MTSS team following the analysis of assessment results.

Person Responsible   Karen Phillips (karen.phillips@osceolaschools.net)

10. Coach will conduct classroom observations in order to provide timely feedback and support for teachers and students with balanced literacy components through the coaching cycle.
11. Administration will protect intervention time to support struggling students.

Person Responsible   Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows for Math 47% of students in grades 3-5 are performing at proficient levels as measured on FSA. Currently, students in grades 3-5 are 16 points below state level and 8 points below district level in proficiency. By providing more time on task, students will be able to increase math levels and improve student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Math: Overall Achievement will increase by 10% from 47% to 57%. Each subgroup will show 2 years worth of measurable growth to close the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003) /, 47

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve math proficiency. Best practices will be grounded in LSI and AVID as well as a focus on the Standards for Mathematical Practice and the Math Progression.
2. Implement a balanced math block that includes content-relevant strategies through whole group, differentiated small group, and independent time.

Person Responsible	Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers document and monitor student evidence of learning via LSI tracker.
4. PLC teams will analyze evidence of student learning to ensure a correlation among all progress monitoring data and adjust instruction to meet the needs of the students.
5. Teachers and students in Grades 4-5 will set goals during one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

Person Responsible	Brandi Derstine (brandi.derstine@osceolaschools.net)

6. Students (including all subgroups) will be trained on strategies to select and utilize across content areas during independent work time. For example, ELL students will have access to education tools and strategies that will help them enhance their performance and mastery of the grade standard.
7. Teachers will be trained on different ESOL strategies and programs that will enhance the academic engagement of ELL students.
8. Instructional staff will purposefully plan for ESE and ELL strategies based on data gathered through formal and informal assessments as evidenced by planning, instruction, and classroom visits.

Person Responsible	Marla Matos (marla.matos@osceolaschools.net)

9. Instructional staff will implement targeted, tiered interventions using varied, research-based instructional strategies to improve math proficiency of all students as identified by the MTSS team following the analysis of assessment results.

Person Responsible Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)

10. Coach will conduct classroom observations in order to provide timely feedback and support for teachers and students with balanced math components through the coaching cycle.
11. Administration will protect intervention time to support struggling students.

Person Responsible Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2018-2019 science achievement was 36% In 2020-2021 science achievement will increase by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give f acts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common
planning PLC.
2. Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards.
3. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
4. Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.
5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses.
6. Teachers conduct individual student data chats.
7. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards, data, student tracking,
collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Melissa Kowalski (melissa.kowalski@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary education for all students - not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals.Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, under represented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019-2020 the grade distribution at the end of the year was as follows: A-%, B-%, C- %, D-% , F-% In 2020-2021 there will be an increase in grades A, B, and C by 5% each grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing postsecondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school.Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported ill their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequenced activities that focus on personal
development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a postsecondary plan.

Person Responsible   Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)

3. Administration and Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.
4. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually
cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

Person Responsible   Monique Badal (monique.badal@osceolaschools.net)

5. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning through AVID.

6. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills and identify opportunities to expose students to future careers or goals during instruction.

Person Responsible Brandi Derstine (brandi.derstine@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome:	2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed 59% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020-2021 this question will be increased 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for SEL to have a sustained effect, it needs to be integrated into the academic mainstream. Frey, Fisher, and Smith explain this as, "if we want students to learn, if we are willing to do what it takes to help them learn,m and if we believe that appropriate learning targets are more than mastery of core academic content areas, the SEL has to become a deliberate presence in our classrooms (p.13). SEL will be integrated at Tier 1 as part of the core instruction that every student receives every day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests that time spent on SEL can facilitate academic learning (Durlak et al., 2011; Hawkins, Smith, & Catalano, 2004). In research conducted by Durlak and colleagues (2011) it is noted that classroom teachers were very effective in implementing SEL. In their documented meta-analysis of SEL programs, teacher implementation resulted in statistically significant outcomes on all six factors studied. Durlak and colleagues suggest teachers' implementation of social and emotional skills, which has an effect size of .62, should focus on "identifying emotions from social cues, goal setting, perspective taking, interpersonal problem solving, conflict resolution, and decision making" (p.6). As Jones and colleagues (2018) explain, "Children who are able to effectively manage their thinking, attention, and behavior are also more likely to have better grades and higher standardized test scores" (p.15).

Action Steps to Implement

1. School staff will take time to cultivate and deepen relationships, build partnerships, and plan for SEL to include student and family voice through two- way communication strategies.
2. School Behavior Coach will provide embedded professional learning to build capacity for all school staff to support students' social-emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Sabrina Kincade (sabrina.kincade@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.
4. Teachers will increase student input and voice through shared decision-making and reflection activities.
5. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are relevant to students, by Identifying and building on students' individual strengths and passions, and engaging through active teaming strategies like hand-on, experimental, and project-based activities.

| **Person Responsible** | Sabrina Kincade (sabrina.kincade@osceolaschools.net) |

6. Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self- confidence, self- efficacy, and social awareness where applicable to ensure consistent opportunities to learn about, reflect on, and practice SEL.

| **Person Responsible** | Sabrina Kincade (sabrina.kincade@osceolaschools.net) |

7. Students (including all subgroups) will be trained on self- management strategies, with an emphasis on emotional regulation, to select and utilize across content areas during collaborative and independent work time.
8. Teachers and students will participate in data chats to discuss goal setting and progress monitoring in all content areas consistently throughout the school year.

| **Person Responsible** | Sabrina Kincade (sabrina.kincade@osceolaschools.net) |

9. All district provided and school-based surveys will be analyzed to identify a schoolwide SEL plan and interventions, including small groups, that will support areas of deficiency.
10. The leadership team will review SEL common formative assessment data and monthly behavior data for all students and subgroups in order to develop tiered interventions as required.
11. Behavior Coach will conduct classroom observations in order to provide timely feedback and support for teachers and students with social-emotional components through the coaching cycle.

| **Person Responsible** | Sabrina Kincade (sabrina.kincade@osceolaschools.net) |

12. Access to mental health and trauma support, for students and staff, will be ensured through systems of support to include the school Behavior Coach, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and outside agencies as needed.
13. Conduct small group tiered lessons.

| **Person Responsible** | Monique Badal (monique.badal@osceolaschools.net) |

14. The SIT team will evaluate behavior and SEL data to track and determine interventions needed.
15. The SIT team will train teachers on how to monitor and implement SEL interventions.

| **Person Responsible** | Karen Phillips (karen.phillips@osceolaschools.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will continue to monitor our students exhibiting two or more indicators on the EWS, (this year's 5th graders) which showed our largest drops and greatest gaps. Leadership team will target each students and attach them to a mentor. Data chats and other motivational items will take place to encourage student motivation and improvement. Students will also be invited to multiple activities (such as 21st Century learning program and acceleration opportunities) for added support. Students with three indicators will partake in SEL focused interventions as added support.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At Central Avenue, we strive to involve all parents and stakeholders as part of the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. We invite families to participate in events including Homework Diner, family nights and other events as held during the year. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. We encourage participation in SAC meetings and communicate with families through multiple methods. We strive to maintain high levels of customer service to create an environment where all stakeholders feel welcomed and included. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders).
The school engages families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral
expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently
communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate
how those beliefs manifest in the school building.
A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been
created.Teachers meet in PLCs a minimum of twice a week to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension.and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school. The next steps to take, such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher.
Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to
students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. Central Avenue is a PBIS school that focuses on positive behavior. The

schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. Finally, The school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills and management.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$101,538.24
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$3,000.00
			Notes: LSI Ignite PLC Refining training			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$3,000.00
			Notes: LSI Ignite PLC Amplifying			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$80,640.00
			Notes: OPS Contracts for Extended PLCs once a week for 36 weeks (for 56 teachers), including social security and retirement fees.			
	6400	210-Retirement	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$8,064.00
	6400	220-Social Security	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$6,834.24
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$153,172.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$12,000.00
			Notes: Open Court Kits for 1st Grade (Phonics program)			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$3,000.00
			Notes: LSI Ignite- Refining student centers and planning			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$3,000.00
			Notes: LSI - Refining student centers and planning			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$114,912.00
			Notes: After school remediation (2 times a week, 3hrs, 20 teachers)			
	5100	210-Retirement	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$11,491.20
			Notes: Retirement			

		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$8,769.60
			Notes: Social security				
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**					**$0.00**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$0.00
			Notes: After school remediation in the area of math. Cost for remediation program is noted under ELA focus area budget lines.				
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**					**$38,316.40**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$425.60
			Notes: 5th Grade Science Bootcamp (2 teachers x 4 days x 2 teachers)				
		5100	210-Retirement	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$42.56
		5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$32.48
		5100	642-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Non-Capitalized	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$1,439.92
			Notes: Sphero STEM Robotics kits for after school program				
		5100	642-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Non-Capitalized	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$21,375.84
			Notes: Sphero Bolt Power Pack and 3 year warranty to support science after school program				
		5100	642-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Non-Capitalized	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$7,500.00
			Notes: ELA Kits to support Science (After school program)				
		5100	642-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Non-Capitalized	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$7,500.00
			Notes: Math Kits to support Science (After school program)				
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students**					**$0.00**
6	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**					**$7,884.76**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$6,703.20
			Notes: Homework Diner- Assisting in family engagement and in teaching strategies to families on assisting with homework and other academic needs.				
		5100	210-Retirement	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$670.00
		5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		$511.56
						Total:	**$319,413.77**