Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 8/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](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

Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crook-Nichols, Diane	Principal	Oversee all classes, coursework, and operations.
Williams, Erin	Assistant Principal	Provide support to the principal, including providing feedback tot he staff, discipline, and stocktake.
Williams, Jannine	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Scherer, George	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Sroka, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Oversee interventions at all grade levels, provide support to teachers to promote best practices, leads the Problem Solving team, and iReady testing coordinator.
Shiver, Amy	School Counselor	Ensure the emotional well-being of students, including working to provide for all basic needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/20/2021, 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.*

5

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

786

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	103	118	123	117	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	692
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	8	17	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	7	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	10	18	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	1	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	8	11	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	107	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		
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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	53%	57%	57%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	51%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				57%	55%	63%	63%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	59%	62%	67%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	45%	51%	66%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	49%	53%	44%	51%	55%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NSGRA and NWEA are used at every grade level to monitor student progress throughout the year. We have two assessments that are used through NWEA, a comprehension assessment and a fluency assessment. Michigan Avenue also uses Successmaker to progress monitor students in mathematics.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44/46%	33/30%	51/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/30%	11/19%	19/34%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	2/15%	4/29%
	English Language Learners	4/24%	0/0%	4/19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/54%	38/34%	61/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/41%	12/21%	23/40%
	Students With Disabilities	7/58%	3/23%	6/43%
	English Language Learners	5/31%	1/5%	3/14%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/55%	63/51%	80/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/53%	31/44%	41/53%
	Students With Disabilities	3/18%	3/14%	5/20%
	English Language Learners	10/48%	9/43%	8/36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55/47%	45/36%	65/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/49%	22/31%	35/45%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	2/9%	5/20%
	English Language Learners	6/29%	3//14%	4/18%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73/68%	67/58%	73/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/65%	28/49%	34/59%
	Students With Disabilities	6/43%	6/38%	4/24%
	English Language Learners	10/63%	8/38%	10/53%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57/51%	59/50%	72/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/40%	21/36%	32/53%
	Students With Disabilities	6/43%	7/41%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	6/35%	5/24%	10/50%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59/55%	58/49%	58/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/45%	29/48%	25/42%
	Students With Disabilities	5/23%	5/20%	5/20%
	English Language Learners	10/48%	8/36%	4/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49/43%	47/39%	43/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/29%	23/38%	17/29%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	1/4%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	5/23%	3/14%	3/13%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/64%	69/61%	62/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/57%	30/48%	25/39%
	Students With Disabilities	8/32%	6/23%	6/23%
	English Language Learners	2/11%	3/14%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/42%	47/42%	50/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/30%	15/24%	18/29%
	Students With Disabilities	4/15%	3/12%	5/19%
	English Language Learners	4/22%	3/14%	4/17%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/67%	72/64%	75/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/60%	33/53%	35/56%
	Students With Disabilities	10/45%	8/31%	12/46%
	English Language Learners	5/28%	5/24%	3/13%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	47	42	24	47	30	29				
ELL	25	26	25	30	50	55	5				
BLK	29			35							
HSP	45	44	33	41	53	50	40				
WHT	56	60		65	66		67				
FRL	37	38	48	40	48	38	37				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We have seen a drop in every area since our last tested year. We are working to bring scores back up this year now that all students are in the building for instruction daily.

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

We dropped 9% in our ELA scores from two years ago. We dropped 7% in mathematics from our scores two years ago, and 3% in Science.

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

Our focus this year is on strong instruction in ELA. We are continuing to utilize Open Court in our lower grade levels and we are implementing a new ELA curriculum. In addition, our school is utililzing the RISE program

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

We showed growth in the Learning Gains in ELA for the lowest quartile.

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

Our school specifically focused on improving ELA for students with disabilities. We plan to increase that even more in the 2021-2022 school year by implementing the new ELA programs and RISE.

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

We need to have a continued focus on building literacy and mathematics skills. As we are moving to a one to one school, it is our hope that student access at home to curriculum will increase and that will directly relate to the improvement of student achievement.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Staff and leadership team members will be implementing a new literacy program called RISE that is designed to help "bubble" readers catapult to the next level. All teachers and team members will be offered specific PD that relates to the implementation of the new curriculum.

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

SEL components, Parent and Family Engagement Activities including "Fall into LIteracy," "Nachos and Numbers," and "The Wax Museum" which encourages parents and students to become involved in activities after school. In addition to the family nights, we will also have tutoring opportunities for

students that are in quarantine so that they do not fall too far behind. The tutoring program will be offered four days a week.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020-2021 school data shows that Michigan Avenue Elementary is 50% proficient in ELA. This is a drop from the 59% proficient in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	The school goal is to increase proficiency and learning gains by 7%.
Monitoring:	NWEA (MAP) and NWEA (Fluency) and NSGRA
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 assesments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction. Teachers will utilize BEST standards.
2. Components of content relevant strategies will include whole group (mini-lessons), small group, and one on one conferencing to meet the individual needs of students.
3. Instructional staff will utilize instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences through collaborative planning.
4. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies throughout ELA whole group and small group instruction.
5. We will specifically focus on teachers who need coaching regarding Tier 1 instruction. We will develop teacher-specific plans and strategies through PLC, coaching cycle, and walkthrough data.
6 Teachers will utilize Open Court and Benchmark curriculum to address Tier I instruction.
7. Teachers will utilize Guided Reading to address Tier II intervention.
8. Teachers will utilize EIR, Corrective Reading and Sonday for Tier 3 intervention.
9. Implement RISE.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math achievement for the last school year was 52%, which is down five points from the 2019 testing.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal for the 2021-2022 is to regain the 8% loss during the pandemic.
Monitoring:	Classroom walkthroughs, data chats, ongoing intervention review, looking for data trends and making necessary adjustments.
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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated math lessons and BEST standards.
2. Staff will assist students' monitoring and reflecting on mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.This will be planned in collaborative planning.
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 through differentiated instruction.
4. WICOR will be implemented in instruction.
5. Teachers will ensure that acceleration of skills and mastery of standards are taught simultaneously through PLCs.
6. Ensure "Growth Mindset" strategies are implemented ongoing with research based material shared throughout for professional development.
7. Tier 1 will use Savaas.
8. Tier II will use Khan Academy.
9. Tier III will use small group targeted instruction.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data in 2019 showed that the school had one subgroup below the ESSA level of 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA data will increase to above 41%.
Monitoring:	Classroom walkthroughs, data chats, PLC monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Palmer (rebecca.palmer@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all of their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau 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. The first is content- the information and skills that students need to learn. Process shows how students make sense of the content being taught. Product is how students demonstrate what they have learned. Affect is the feelings and attitudes the students have toward the learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will utilize AVID WICOR strategies to improve student achievement for all students.
2. Through implementation of the BEST standards, teachers will differentiate instruction, specifically with a focus on students with disabilities.
3. Using NEST data, the leadership team will review data to provide coaching and feedback to teachers.
4. Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
5. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
6. Teachers will focus on creating student specific IEP goals.
7. Coaches will work with teachers to ensure best teaching practices including Rigor, Engagement, and the Differentiated Classroom.
8. All lessons will address equity and diversity.
7. MTSS interventions are addressed for all SWD students.

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.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2020-2021 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 8%.
Monitoring:	At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the team will survey the students again using the Panorama survey. We will then compare that data to last year's support group.
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 the 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 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Mrs. Shiver and Mrs. Ballesteros will go into all classrooms once per month to address SEL components.
2. Mrs. Shiver and Mrs. Ballesteros will focus on strengthening the teacher focus to build capacity in the CUPS.
3. SEL is built into the FOCUS strategies and the AVID strategies. Utilization of those components will improve our Social and Emotional Learning, including a Post Secondary plan.
4. Mrs. Shiver and Mrs. Ballesteros will ensure that grades 3-5 participate in the Panorama Survey. We will utilize the data from the survey to increase student belonging.
5. Parents are invited and encouraged to attend Title I Events.
6. The PBIS team will meet monthly and review discipline data.
7. Staff will focus on equity and diversity for all students.
8. All staff members are responsible for school safety.
9. Staff and student attendance are monitored monthly to ensure accurate EWS data.

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our achievement level in 2019 was 52% and it dropped to 49% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal for achievement for this year is to increase to 59% proficiency on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Science Assessment.
Monitoring:	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.
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 the lecture and the textbook. (Lynch and Zenchak, 2002)

Action Steps to Implement

1. We are going to implement an initiative that is called Houses of Science. It begins on September 15 based on the BEST Standards.
2. We are administering a mock Science FSA by September 15 to establish a baseline for student achievement. The data will be reviewed in PLCs.
3. We will provide instructional coaching for all teachers to fortify Science instruction.
4. Science will be implemented through iii time for 5th grade, allowing for small group instruction.
5. WICOR will be expected throughout the grade levels to increase science achievement.
6. Elevate is used as a Tier I strategy.
7. Small groups are used as a Tier II intervention and teaching Fair Game standards.
8. Tier III best practices will be applied for students that are struggling with mastery of standards.

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

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school has adopted the SDOC4E Got Goals program which focuses on enroll, enlist, employ, and explore.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, students will have had at least five experiences that align with the SDOC4E programming.
Monitoring:	Our school will incorporate college and career readiness activities monthly and they will be published on the monthly calendar.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erin Williams (erin.williams@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation that engages 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 of 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 student aspirations for continuing their education must expand just beyond lessons for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will engage in College Week in September. Some of our activities will include "My College Application."
2. Every Wednesday staff and students are encouraged to wear college and career focused shirts, including AVID.
3. We will also host a career day to expose students to a variety of careers through the "Wax Museum."
4. We will utilize Xello to explore post graduate/career readiness options for students.
5. We will implement AVID WICOR strategies to help enhance college readiness.

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

#7. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The leadership team is focused on providing meaningful feedback to teachers after class visits to help improve teacher development.
Measurable Outcome:	The administration will complete at least ten walkthroughs each week, targeting different grade levels on each day. The results will be uploaded into the NESTI.
Monitoring:	The administrative team will review the data that has been uploaded into the NESTI to look for classroom trends and provide feedback that can improve student achievement and teacher performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erin Williams (erin.williams@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The administration is utilizing the NEST tool to target specific areas that are being observed during classroom observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through targeted and specific feedback to teachers, the leadership team will be able to identify trends and provide specific coaching strategies to teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All leadership team members will participate in regular professional development that addresses curriculum, behaviors, and interventions for students.
2. The leadership team will disaggregate data monthly during Stocktake meetings, including reviewing walkthrough data and determining specific teacher need.
3, During weekly leadership team meetings and Stocktake, the team will review teacher feedback and develop coaching cycles to improve student achievement.
4. All administrators will utilize the NEST in at least 50% of classroom walkthroughs. The data will be reviewed during leadership team meetings and Stocktake.

Person Responsible	Erin Williams (erin.williams@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Although this school is not listed on the website SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, we do have a focus on student behavior. The majority of our discipline incidents last year were from classroom disruption. The school has implemented a Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program. This team meets once each month to review data and plan to improve student behaviors. The team analyzes school data and brainstorms ways to provide supports to students and staff.

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.

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 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 the school, and all students are enrolled in a 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.

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

The stakeholders at Michigan Avenue include parents, students, staff members, and community members. We invite all to be part of our School Advisory Council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00