

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Michigan Avenue Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

**Principal: Diane Crook Nichols**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

[www.osceolaschools.net](http://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 KG-5	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

Michigan Avenue Elementary school will cultivate a collaborative community of students, parents, and teachers to ensure all can learn and grow into creative well rounded individuals.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Michigan Avenue Elementary will provide quality, effective, and rigorous instruction such that Osceola County will out-perform all other districts in the State of Florida.

### 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
Crook-Nichols, Diane	Principal	Oversee all classes, coursework, and operations.
Shiver, Amy	School Counselor	Ensure the emotional well-being of students, including working to provide all basic needs.
Williams, Erin	Assistant Principal	Provide support to the principal, including providing feedback to staff, discipline, and stocktake.
Sroka, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Oversee interventions for all grade levels, provide support to teachers to promote best practices, leads the Problem Solving team, and iReady testing coordinator.
Williams, Jannine	Instructional Coach	PLC Facilitator and Reading Interventionist
Scherer, George	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Palmer, Rebecca	Other	Resource Compliance Specialist

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Diane Crook Nichols

**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.*

44

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

64

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	



<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	107	105	128	116	124	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	705
Attendance below 90 percent	25	19	25	17	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 9/4/2020

### 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	81	91	95	95	91	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	11	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	33	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

**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	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	81	91	95	95	91	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	11	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	33	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

**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	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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	59%	53%	57%	57%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	50%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	51%	53%	50%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	55%	63%	63%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	59%	62%	63%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	45%	51%	52%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	53%	58%	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	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	51%	4%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	53%	5%	64%	-6%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	58%	48%	10%	60%	-2%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	41%	49%	-8%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	29	43	41	24	54	61	20				
ELL	34	47	41	40	58	57	33				
BLK	50	60		61	80						
HSP	48	51	50	50	64	59	44				
MUL	64			64	80						
WHT	69	55	40	64	68	50	62				
FRL	52	50	46	52	66	61	47				
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	17	39	26	20	39	33	27				
ELL	36	47	37	32	50	56					
BLK	37	53		47	67						
HSP	48	52	39	51	64	69	34				
MUL	57	50		60	40						
WHT	67	54	38	75	72	53	63				
FRL	53	57	45	60	66	71	40				

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	9	33	43	27	48	38					
ELL	30	40	32	41	54	62	18				
BLK	29	24		29	29	10	20				
HSP	46	48	44	52	59	60	38				
MUL	75			83							
WHT	69	56	62	73	69	62	81				
FRL	50	52	50	58	61	45	44				

### 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	56
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
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	46
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	63
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	53
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	69
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	54
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.**

As we did not participate in state testing during the 2019/2020 school year, we did not have FSA data to compare with from the previous year. However, our concerns continue to be focusing on ELA scores, particularly for students with disabilities.

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

No testing was completed in 2019-2020 using state assessments.

**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.**

N/A

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

Based on assessment scores, Michigan Avenue made the most improvement in achievement levels in Science. The factors that contributed to this are district formative assessments and regular participation in the weekly Science review, called the "Battle Royale."

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

Because 100% of our students were digital learners from March to May 2020, and 30% of our students are currently digital learners, we are concerned about student achievement.

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

1. COVID Slide
2. Providing interventions for digital students.
3. Providing interventions for students with disabilities, both face to face and digitally.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The 2018-2019 School Data shows that Michigan Avenue Elementary is 53% proficient in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency and learning gains by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jannine Williams (jannine.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The analysis of student assessment data is vital 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 the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that the 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 assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

**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.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.
3. Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement
4. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, through targeted, tiered interventions.
5. Instructional staff will utilize instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
6. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
7. Administration will offer intervention time to support struggling students.

**Person Responsible:** Jannine Williams (jannine.wilson@osceolaschools.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Given the 2018-2019 school data finding that only 57% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase math proficiency by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The 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 the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that the 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 assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.
2. Staff will assist students' monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
3. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient in mathematics based on a variety of assessments. In addition, advanced students will be offered to students to extend their learning.
4. Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.
5. Students will cognitively engage in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques, supported by quality feedback and the ability to self assess progress related to the outcome.

**Person Responsible:** George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ESSA data showed in the 2018-2019 school year that the school had one subgroup below the ESSA level 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	ESSA Data for 2018-2019 for ESE will increase to be above 41%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Rebecca Palmer (rebecca.palmer@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately 7 challenging learning experiences for all their students. 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
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers 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 on instructional strategies that scaffold content for ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies and ESE support strategies.
5. The ESE support in the classroom will occur through the RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Palmer (rebecca.palmer@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. 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 improved 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:**

Based on the 2019-2020 Panorama Student Survey, our students scored at 42% under the category of Emotional Regulation. As a Zones of Regulation School, our goal is to increase this particular competency by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Shiver (amy.shiver@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered,. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students, identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions.
2. Teachers will build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self awareness, self management, responsible decision making, relationship skills, and social awareness.
7. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities which support students' SEL development.
8. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions.
9. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required

**Person Responsible**

Amy Shiver (amy.shiver@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. 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 52% In 2020-2021, Science achievement will increase by 5%.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts 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 and 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 will collaborate weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards.
3. Teachers will participate in PD that will utilize 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. VE teachers will support Science knowledge through the integration of Science through ELA.
6. Teachers will provide individual student data chats.
7. The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises.

**Person  
Responsible**

George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. 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 postsecondary 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, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the school year, 90% of our fifth grade students will have an increased awareness of college and career readiness following completion of a Forms survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy Shiver (amy.shiver@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. In these types of 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 in 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 for students alone.

**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 sequential activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a postsecondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.
5. Administration and the 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.
6. School will create a plan that creates positivity.

**Person Responsible** Amy Shiver (amy.shiver@osceolaschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Michigan Avenue will participate in the Stocktake process that allows the team to meet monthly to review progress and make adjustments.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The school offers multiple programs to ensure that we have a positive community culture. Some of these programs include Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), and the School Leadership Council. We also offer a variety of after school events including Multi-Cultural Night, STEM Night, Literacy Night, and more to invite families to our campus with the intent to strengthen our community bond.

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and holds staff responsible for implementing any changes. The school frequently communicates high expectations for all students (e.g. "All students are college material.") Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: collaborative planning is solutions oriented and based on disaggregated data, student work is displayed throughout school, all students are enrolled in college and career ready prep curriculum.

A clear Code of Conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLC's weekly 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 and what needs to be done. Some examples include: establishing specific and attainable strategies for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input and 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 their needs and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and are accessible to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates 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 interest. 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.



The school's curriculum and teacher's lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC. It reaches out to families and the community early and often on- not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what is being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (scheduled to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and child-care).

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$48,385.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0271 - Michigan Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$48,385.00	
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$46,535.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0271 - Michigan Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$46,535.00	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					\$2,274.91
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	3374	500-Materials and Supplies	0271 - Michigan Avenue Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,274.91	
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science					\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students					\$0.00
Total:							\$145,579.91