

School District of Osceola County, FL

Central Avenue Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	33

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nadia Winston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	33

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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 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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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 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.
Matos, Marla	ELL Compliance Specialist	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.
Hajian, Michelle	Math Coach	Works with classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted math program in response to intervention needed for student achievement.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wittko, Michelle	Reading Coach	The Literacy/Reading Coach ensures students receive high-quality literacy instruction. The Literacy Coach leads the development and improvement for 10-12 teachers in a school building via training, observations, model lessons, feedback, conversations, data analysis and more.
Kinder, Dawn	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Kinder provides training and support to teachers on the critical features and essential practices of behavior management in classroom settings (school wide Tier I for behavior). The responsibilities of the position include collecting, maintaining and analyzing behavior data, communicating with parents/guardians, collecting data and reporting requirements for coordinated early intervening services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, 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.*

4

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

637

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

14

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

19

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	71	82	92	93	97	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	15	14	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	3	5	2	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	27	18	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	16	8	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	38	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	11	17	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	4	3	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	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	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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

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	73	87	79	103	94	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	74	91	82	102	94	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	38	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	2	5	3	17	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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				34%	53%	57%	39%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	58%	55%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	51%	53%	55%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	55%	63%	46%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	59%	62%	61%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	45%	51%	61%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	49%	53%	55%	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	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2021					
	2019	28%	48%	-20%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	45%	-15%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool to be utilized is the NWEA growth MAP assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29/37%	21/23%	28/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/38%	15/22%	18/27%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	0/0%	1/10%
	English Language Learners	4/13%	4/10%	8/19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/42%	22/24%	35/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/43%	14/21%	18/27%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	10/28%	8/21%	14/33%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/39%	23/25%	31/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/44%	23/25%	27/39%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	2/29%	2/29%
	English Language Learners	13/39%	11/26%	8/18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/41%	6/14%	23/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/45%	19/28%	17/25%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	1/14%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	14/41%	6/14%	12/27%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/38%	35/32%	41/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/47%	31/37%	36/39%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	2/10%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	13/26%	12/22%	16/26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29/29%	25/23%	33/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/34%	22/26%	26/28%
	Students With Disabilities	3/18%	2/10%	3/13%
	English Language Learners	8/16%	7/13%	11/18%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/32%	24/23%	25/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/32%	18/24%	17/22%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	2/14%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	9/21%	9/18%	8/15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28/31%	31/30%	24/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/37%	25/33%	17/22%
	Students With Disabilities	2/17%	1/7%	1/7%
	English Language Learners	9/20%	9/18%	8/14%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/36%	28/29%	27/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/35%	18/26%	18/25%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	0/0%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	9/23%	13/29%	8/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29/35%	20/21%	26/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/38%	12/17%	21/29%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	0/0%	1/5%
	English Language Learners	12/30%	6/14%	9/19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	33/39%	33/35%	38/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/38%	22/32%	25/35%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17%	2/10%	2/8%
	English Language Learners	12/30%	11/26%	15/31%

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	5	23		17	25		20				
ELL	25	54	42	26	37	10	22				
BLK	37	64		32	45		27				
HSP	28	45	40	28	31	13	23				
WHT	37			37							
FRL	30	54	50	28	36	20	24				
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				

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
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				

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	33
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

According to the NWEA/MAP district progress monitoring data, there was an overall lack of growth in English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency (at or below 34% in all grade levels) from our Fall assessments to Spring and a decrease in proficiency in grade levels include KG, 4th and 5th grades. The same lack of proficiency was seen in all grade levels in math (Proficiency at or below 27% with the exception of KG at 36%) and overall decreases in proficiency percentages in KG, 3rd, 4th and 5th. There were decreases in the proficiency of Students with disabilities (SWD) population or no growth in proficiency in every grade level in both ELA and Math. English Language Learners (ELL) on the other hand showed some increase in proficiency in both ELA and Math in KG and 3rd grade and 5th grade Science, but decreases in all other grade levels. Prior year NWEA progress monitoring data shows lowest growth from Fall to Spring assessment periods for ELA for our Black subgroup overall (Median student growth at 19%), and in Math for our Hispanic/Latino subgroup overall (median student growth at 35%).

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

Based on progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessment data, there continues to be low proficiency and growth with the SWD population (2019 data showed that SWD population at 33%-below the federal index of 41% proficiency). Our ELL population are showing minimal growth in both ELA and Math per NWEA data, but much less growth than what is needed to match state assessment ESSA marker data where ELL were at the federal index of 41% proficiency and where progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency was at 39% per 2019 data). ELA proficiency remains low (at or below 34% in all grade levels) with low growth which is consistent with low proficiency seen in ELA on 2019 state assessment data (with proficiency at 32% in 3rd grade, 24% in 4th grade and 28% in 5th grade). The greatest need for improvement would be our SWD population in both ELA and Math. Other areas include both ELA and Math overall since there is an overall lack of growth represented in the majority of grade levels in these academic areas..

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

Gaps in curriculum and instructional implementation may contributing to the disproportionate impacts on struggling learners. Thus gaps in Tier I system implementation with scaffolding and differentiation for struggling learners is a contributing factor to this need for improvement. Also Inconsistent knowledge and application of differentiated approaches, interventions, and assessments for students that need for support may be a contributing factor.

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

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%.

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

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.

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

Implementation of strong instruction, deep student engagement strategies, and supports targeted to the skills and services students need to stay on grade level will accelerate student learning. Scaffolding and differentiated instruction must be implemented during Tier I instruction to support and accelerate learning for all students (including struggling learners). Collaborative learning structures and other strategies (through Kagan, AVID, and LSI techniques) must be implemented to engage all learners into instruction and lessons, and to assist learners with developing higher order thinking skills that will lead to greater independence and ownership of their learning. Finally careful monitoring and tracking student learning and growth is key to making necessary adaptations and adjustments to instruction to further support and accelerate students based on needs present in student formative, progress monitoring, and summative assessment data.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, instructional staff members (and other staff members working with students) could further develop their skills in using student learning evidence to inform instruction. This would include specific professional development in reading student progress monitoring data (NSGRA and NWEA) and using that information to plan differentiated instruction and scaffolds within Tier I instruction. This would include more intensive professional development on guided reading and guided math practices. Professional development on supporting high needs populations (SWD and ELL specifically) would be extremely beneficial considering the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning. This would include professional development on equitable teaching practices with culturally relevant lessons and professional development on equitable Tier I behavior practices. Further professional development on the Professional Learning Communities process to include using student formative data and learning evidence to inform instruction. Professional Development in specific student collaboration strategies and AVID strategies and processes would benefit all instructional staff members and would positively impact student engagement and motivation. Also, professional development in the MTSS framework and intervention for students in need of more intensive support or enrichment would be beneficial. Coaches and leadership could continue learning more strategies for monitoring and feedback to identify and act upon the learning needs of all instructional staff members.

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

Additional paid time-frames for professional development in needed areas will be given through the Sig-4 grant which can lead to deeper understanding and application of items to be learned. Development of model teachers and teacher leaders will create a sustainable system for professional development practices within respective grade levels (through the PLC process). Additional new teacher mentorship will be critical this year to build strong teachers and ensure sustainability of improvement. We will also ensure strong and aligned collaboration with district resource staff to support improvement initiatives and strengthen school level leaders for continued implementation of effective practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Implementation of strong instruction, deep student engagement strategies, and supports targeted to the skills and services students need to stay on grade level will accelerate student learning. 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. Progress monitoring has become a critically important tool for improving the academic outcomes of all students, including students with disabilities (Shapiro, 2008).

Along with monitoring for student achievement through progress monitoring data, monitoring instruction is critical to school improvement efforts. Classroom walkthroughs are a tool to “drive a cycle of continuous improvement by focusing on the effects of instruction.” Cervone and Martinez-Miller (2007).

Measurable Outcome:

2019-20 Insight Survey results under the Instructional Planning for student growth area, only 34% of teachers agree that they were satisfied with the support they received at for instructional planning. Only 51% agreed that the school dedicated time for teachers to analyze student work and/or assessments to plan for future instruction based on student performance. 2021-22 Insight Survey results will show more than 10% growth in both areas noted above.

Monitoring:

Each leadership team member will attend and support PLC meetings to ensure fidelity of collaborative planning processes and progress monitoring processes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The MTSS team and PLCs will work together to strengthen instructional practices, scaffolds, and supports during Tier 1 instruction. The MTSS team will work with the PLCs to recognize trends in data and need area with which to focus upon grade level wise or within respective classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Careful monitoring and tracking student learning and growth is key to making necessary adaptations and adjustments to instruction to further support and accelerate students based on needs present in student formative, progress monitoring, and summative assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS and PLC teams will meet monthly to review student data and work in tandem to determine needed resources, instructional needs, intervention needs and other supports for student achievement.

Person Responsible

Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Monitoring for implementation of Tier I instruction will take place through weekly walkthroughs by the leadership team, including administration and coaches.

Person Responsible

Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

The MTSS team and PLCs will work together to recognize trends in data to strengthen instructional practices, scaffolds, and supports during Tier 1 instruction. 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.

Person Responsible Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Grade level PLCs focused on formative assessment data to determine flex group needs and needed scaffolded supports and differentiation in the classroom and in PROWL time (interventions).

Person Responsible Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

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 Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff members will be trained in progress monitoring data systems and analyzing student data.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Implementation of strong instruction, deep student engagement strategies, and supports targeted to the skills and services students need to stay on grade level will accelerate student learning. Opportunities to accelerate learning rely on robust Tier 1 instruction that includes grade-appropriate assignments. Accelerated learning keeps students moving forward on their intended grade-level trajectories by strategically preparing them for success in current grade-level content. Students can accelerate by providing them with with “the most personalized and engaging instruction possible” focused on the essential skills for their grade level (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2020).

Measurable Outcome:

According to the NWEA/MAP district progress monitoring data, there was an overall lack of growth in English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency (at or below 34% in all grade levels) from our Fall assessments to Spring and a decrease in proficiency in grade levels include KG, 4th and 5th grades. NWEA/MAP district progress monitoring data will show overall growth of over 10% in every grade level (to 40% or higher).

Monitoring:

Monitoring for implementation of solid Tier I ELA instruction will be monitored through weekly walkthroughs by the leadership team, including administration and coaches. Student evidence of learning will be monitoring during walkthroughs. The goal is to know all students in each class to allow the curriculum leadership team to appropriately identify tasks and strategies students are engaged in and whether tasks are meeting students' specific needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative learning structures and other strategies (through Kagan, AVID, and LSI techniques) must be implemented to engage all learners into instruction and lessons, and to assist learners with developing higher order thinking skills that will lead to greater independence and ownership of their learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Indicators for student engagement include active learning strategies such as cooperative learning, project-based learning, and inquiry-based learning that deepen the understanding of what students are learning and why they are learning it (ASCD, 2021).

Action Steps to Implement

All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy. These best practices strategies include LSI collaborative approaches such as teaming, AVID strategies, acceleration and guided reading.

Person Responsible

Michelle Wittko (michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers of reading/ELA will 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)

Careful monitoring and weekly group walk-throughs followed by debriefs connected to instructional vision and student data points, leading to monthly stocktake meetings.

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

100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans.

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

Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.

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

First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development.

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

Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development.

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

T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation.

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

T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation.

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

RISE reading for T2

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When Tier 1 is implemented with a high degree of integrity and by trained educators, a majority of learners will show proficiency on curricular assessments consistent with the grade-level benchmarks (Swanson et al. 2017). As noted by Sporer (2009), scaffolding is a vital part of instruction that promotes collaboration, independence and the application of learned strategies and skills.

Measurable Outcome: Math median growth (at or below 24%). There will be an increase in overall Math median growth in all grade levels by 10% or higher.

Monitoring: Monitoring for implementation of solid Tier I ELA and Math instruction will be monitored through weekly walkthroughs by the leadership team, including administration and coaches. Student evidence of learning will be monitoring during walkthroughs. The goal is to know all students in each class to allow the curriculum leadership team to appropriately identify tasks and strategies students are engaged in and whether tasks are meeting students' specific needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Children may require different degrees and types of intervention at different times in their school career, or for different aspects of the mathematics curriculum. Interventions should be guided by data to identify a student's strengths and weaknesses. Flexible small grouping in mathematics, also known as Guided Math, is a data-driven intervention that matches a student's readiness level for learning with the appropriate instructional strategy, delivering the right content at the right pace (Benders & Craft, 2016).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Significant efforts are being made to improve reading through research-based instructional strategies, resources, and professional development; however, there is limited number of designated resources dedicated toward mathematical instructional initiatives (Crowe, Connor, & Mazzocco 2011). Many math educators are still delivering math instruction in a one-size fit all models. Classrooms are filled with mixed abilities ranging from learning styles to academic readiness.

Action Steps to Implement

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.

Person Responsible Michelle Hajian (michelle.hajian@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will implement a balanced math block that includes content-relevant strategies through whole group, differentiated small group, and independent time.

Person Responsible Michelle Hajian (michelle.hajian@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

One difficulty facing educators today is meeting the needs of individual learners. The traditional classroom now encompasses a range of mixed abilities among students - some struggling to meet grade level standards to those performing above grade level. Scaffolding and differentiated instruction must be implemented during Tier I instruction to support and accelerate learning for all students (including struggling learners).

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Scaffolding supports reading comprehension and lets students develop into more competent readers. Guided reading and scaffolding “allows teachers to acknowledge and respect the skills students already possess” (Morgan, 2013, p. 23). Differentiated mathematic instruction is a powerful way to potentially increase student learning is a strategy supported by several researchers (Huebner 2010; Murray 2007; Newton 2013; Sammons, 2010; Taylor-Cox 2013).

According to research, differentiated instruction is the most effective teaching strategy to improve student achievement (Slavin, Lake, & Groff, 2010). When a teacher has a student population such as students with disabilities or English Language Learners (ELLs), it is especially important to guide the development of their understanding in a way that they are clearly supported.

Measurable Outcome:

According to the NWEA/MAP district progress monitoring data, there was an overall lack of growth in English Language Arts (ELA) median student growth (at or below 34% in all grade levels) and math median growth (at or below 24%). There will be an increase in overall ELA median growth and Math median growth in all grade levels by 10% or higher in ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

Monitoring for implementation of solid Tier I ELA and Math instruction will be monitored through weekly walkthroughs by the leadership team, including administration and coaches. Student evidence of learning will be monitoring during walkthroughs. The goal is to know all students in each class to allow the curriculum leadership team to appropriately identify tasks and strategies students are engaged in and whether tasks are meeting students' specific needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will use progress monitoring and formative assessment data to analyze the needs of the students and implement flexible small group instruction (with acceleration and scaffolding).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When the quality core instruction is not sufficient to meet the needs of all students, smaller groups and more individualized instruction are needed to remediate (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). Flexible small group instruction reaches all students at their level of development and takes them to the next level (Sammons, 2010).

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional staff members will be given professional development in the area of small group guided math/ flexible grouping strategies.

Person Responsible

Michelle Hajian (michelle.hajian@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff members will be given professional development in small group, guided reading/flexible grouping strategies.

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

Coaches will conduct classroom observations in order to provide timely feedback and support for teachers and students with balanced literacy components through the coaching cycle.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: It is crucial that schools have the same high expectations for achievement for all students, no matter their race, ethnicity, income-level or disability. Historically, many states and schools have not expected SWDs to perform as well as other students. This false perception can lead to lower student achievement and to a lack of resources devoted to students with disabilities (McGrew & Evans, 2003).

Measurable Outcome: Based on progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessment data, there continues to be low proficiency and growth with the SWD population (2019 data showed that SWD population at 33%- below the federal index of 41% proficiency). Our ELL population are showing minimal growth in both ELA and Math per NWEA data, but much less growth than what is needed to match state assessment ESSA marker data where ELL were at the federal index of 41% proficiency and where progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency was at 39% per 2019 data). We will increase the proficiency of our SWD and ELL population by 10%.

Monitoring: Monitoring for implementation of solid Tier I ELA and Math instruction will be monitored through weekly walkthroughs by the leadership team, including administration and coaches. Student evidence of learning will be monitoring during walkthroughs. The goal is to know all students in each class to allow the curriculum leadership team to appropriately identify tasks and strategies students are engaged in and whether tasks are meeting students' specific needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marla Matos (marla.matos@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use progress monitoring and formative assessment data to analyze the needs of the students and implement flexible small group instruction (with acceleration and scaffolding).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When the quality core instruction is not sufficient to meet the needs of all students, smaller groups and more individualized instruction are needed to remediate (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). According to research, differentiated instruction is the most effective teaching strategy to improve studentachievement (Slavin, Lake, & Groff, 2010). When a teacher has a student population such as students with disabilities or English Language Learners (ELLs), it is especially important to guide the development of their understanding in a way that they are clearly supported.Flexible small group instruction reaches all students at their level of development and takes them to the next level (Sammons, 2010).

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained on different ESOL strategies and programs that will enhance the academic engagement of ELL students.

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

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)

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.

Person Responsible Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Varying Exceptionalities teachers will join grade level PLC meetings. SWD student evidence of learning will be analyzed and adaptations made to instruction and supports as needed.

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

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social and emotional learning (SEL) is critical to the success of students from preschool through high school — and for educators, across all stages of the career continuum (Markowitz, Thowdis, & Gallager, 2018). 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. Research on educational outcomes has demonstrated the importance of positive social behaviors in fostering academic achievement (Blake et al., 2015).

Measurable Outcome: Panarama data proves that more than 50% of students lack a sense of belonging in the school (elements include that they do not feel as though they have others to go to), and sense of safety was another concern.

Monitoring: Monitoring of Panarama data will be done when it is release. Classrooms will also be monitored for implementation of resources such as Zones of Regulation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lissette Bonilla (lissette.bonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: A well rounded approach to teaching SEL techniques will be implemented by instructional staff members and other intervention staff members school-wide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Training and support for SEL are rare at all levels. According to Weissberg et al. (2015) one of the most prevalent SEL approaches “involves training teachers to deliver explicit lessons that teach social and emotional skills, then finding opportunities for students to reinforce their use throughout the day” (2015, p. 8).

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional staff members will implement Zones of Regulation or Quaver lessons for students through embedded Curriculum Unit Plan lessons.

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

Extra interventions will be added through the 21st Century grant program for students in need of more intensive interventions.

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

#7. 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 of students (63 total) with more than one EWS indicator at the end of the year was as follows:
3rd - 27 4th - 18 5th -39
In 2020-2021 there will be a decrease in the number of students exhibiting more than one indicator at the end of the school year by at least 4%.

Monitoring: Career selection technology and embedded curriculum will be examined for student use and engagement..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Monique Badal (monique.badal@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in kindergarten through 5th grade will use various systems to explore future career options. AVID will also be implemented school-wide.

Rationale for 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 post-secondary 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. 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 students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained on articulated set of grade-level sequenced activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a post-secondary plan.

Person Responsible Lissette Bonilla (lissette.bonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Students 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 post-secondary plan.

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

Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, selfassessment, time management, and planning through AVID.

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

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 Monique Badal (monique.badal@osceolaschools.net)

Students will be exposed to STEM related lessons and tasks through an added STEM block.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

CENTRAL AVENUE ELEMENTARY school has 1.0 reported incidents per 100 students. Though this rate of incidents of crime, violence, and disruptive behaviors are less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students, we ranked 962 of 1395 elementary schools statewide (13th of 15 schools in the county) for behavioral incidents. Further analysis of the data proved the following areas of concerns:

- Majority of referrals occurred February and after
- The most referrals occurred in April
- The highest instances were in the classroom
- First grade and Fourth grade had the highest number of incidents
- Most referrals were written on our Black and Hispanic students
- We also noted that a number of behavior incidents took place in a behavioral self contained unit

Overall, the area of concern that we will monitor first is the area where the highest instances of behavioral concerns occur- the classroom. Tier I behavior expectations must be established and taught to all students for all areas, especially in the classroom. We will reteach and set up a consistent system of monitoring for our PBIS framework school-wide. This includes teaching students classroom procedures and expectations.

We will also ensure clarity of our school wide system for behavior in order to incorporate them into weekly behavior lessons for students. We will also incorporate some Social Emotional Learning lessons school-wide (which are incorporated into district Curriculum Unit Plans) and ensure targeted interventions to specific students in upper tiers for behavior. Walk-throughs focused on PBIS implementation will be conducted to monitor for Tier I framework elements and to implement needed actions or training. Self Contained ESE classes will also receive focused training on behavioral interventions and supports to decrease behavioral incidents occurring in those areas.

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.

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 PLC's a minimum of three times 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.

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

One of the most important parts of promoting and establishing a positive culture and environment is building relationships. The leadership of the school will set the tone through setting the vision and establishing systems to support relationship building throughout the school. We will continue with implementation of Professional Learning Communities where instructional team members may gather and support each other in a professional manner. This approach will allow for instructional staff the value each other and the varying levels of expertise they bring. Leadership will also incorporate ways to have teachers lead and model for other teachers. This will continue to show value in these staff members. When they feel valued, they will endure, work hard and support the vision that was set forth. We will also create time frames to reflect and celebrate successes as a group and individually. Leadership can also foster great relationships with parents by holding support and information sessions to help parents support parents in supporting the learning of their children.

Students will have opportunities to be leaders through the AVID program and process. They will participate in tracking their own data and successes, and will be involved in processes to feel pride and satisfaction in their own academic and social efforts. When students feel liked and respected by their teachers, they find more success in school, academically and behaviorally (Lewis, Schaps & Watson, 1996).

Teachers can foster positive relationships with parents and students through constant communication, feedback and support. Information about classroom items, activities, curriculum, behavior or other elements helpful to parents are freely and consistently communicated to build trusting relationships and positive interactions.

Community members and business persons can partner with the school to support mentoring initiatives, lessons for students and parents, financial support for programs or food at events and the like. These partnerships support the vision and mission of the school. These partners may be involved in school wide events that support academic initiatives and/or social emotional initiatives for the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems				\$7,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		\$7,200.00
			<i>Notes: Stipend pay for teachers to attend PD 2 days before Pre-planning 2 days x 36 teachers x \$100/day.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$54,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		\$54,000.00
			<i>Notes: Additional OPS hours for PD during PLC meetings (extended PLC 4 times a month/ 1hr for 10 months x 34 teachers =1,360 hours.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$32,000.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		\$32,000.00
			<i>Notes: OPS for extended weekly hours for data disaggregation and PLC PD development and facilitation 8 times a month/2hrs for 10 months x 5 academic coaches = 800 hours.</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$31,920.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Central Avenue Elementary Schl	SIG 1003		\$31,920.00
			<i>Notes: OPS for After school acceleration/tutoring for 100 students- 4 times a week x 1.0 hour x 10 teachers x 30 weeks.</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture for all students				\$0.00
					Total:	\$125,120.00