

School District of Osceola County, FL

Central Avenue Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nadia Winston

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: 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	CSI
* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Avenue Elementary School

500 W COLUMBIA AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	92%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		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 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Winston, Nadia	Principal	The principal (Nadia Winston) is responsible for the school Stocktake, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback. The principal and assistant monitor the instructional coaches with implementation of the instructional focus. The principal will also coach 2-3 teachers every 2 weeks on instructional techniques using the "Plan, Do, Observe, Act" coaching model. In addition, the principal provides feedback on the evaluation tool in a timely manner to inform instruction and in turn, positively effect teaching and learning.
DeRight, Amanda	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal (Amanda DeRight) is responsible for the school Stocktake, monitoring 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.
Hajian, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The Math and Science coach (Dr. Michelle Hajian) works with classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted math and science programs and the school instructional focus. This coach will also work to support implementation and monitoring of response to intervention needed for student achievement.
Wittko, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The Literacy/Reading Coach (Michelle Wittko) ensures students receive high quality literacy instruction. The Literacy Coach leads the development and improvement for instruction related to reading and writing for teachers in the school building via training, observations, model lessons, feedback, conversations, data analysis and more. The literacy coach also monitors and supports implementation of response to intervention to support student achievement.
Matos, Marla	ELL Compliance Specialist	The English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) specialist maintains compliance with limited English proficiency designations, maintains assessment standards for students in this program and monitors 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.
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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		parents/guardians, collecting data and reporting requirements for coordinated early intervening services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/11/2022, Nadia Winston

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

610

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	74	88	88	105	99	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	48	48	39	39	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	2	5	3	1	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	21	17	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	31	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	37	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	60	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	9	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	8	1	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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

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	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	2	7	1	12	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	48%	56%				34%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						59%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	44%	50%				47%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						49%	59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						41%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	18%	46%	59%				36%	49%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	28%	48%	-20%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	30%	45%	-15%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	14	35	55	11	31	25					
ELL	29	46	60	28	45	60	20				
BLK	33	50		33	35						
HSP	28	46	55	26	46	57	21				
WHT	60			40							
FRL	30	46	55	27	47	54	19				

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				
WHT	53	55		65	60						
FRL	31	49	57	46	49	44	33				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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%) 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 little increase in proficiency in both ELA and Math in KG and 3rd grade and 5th grade Science, but decreases in all other grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring data and 2022 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 2022 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 2022 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELA LQ increased 1%, with learning gains decreasing by 6%, but lowest quartile increased by 7%. The Math achievement decreased 1%, with a lowest quartile achievement increase of 37%.

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 or 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 Uni-Sig 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 the 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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teacher participation in authentic Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) will assist in the creation and implementation of engaging lessons (planned during this process), that include high yield strategies, best practices, and common formative assessments. 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.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.
This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Proficiency and gains in ELA and Math will increase by 5% in all groups.
 Proficiency in Science will increase by 3%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration:
 1. Administrators will monitor coach and leadership team schedules to ensure support in PLT time frames.
 2. Administration will monitor the collaborative teams submitted planning documents to ensure time is being use effectively and to evaluate the PLT stage progression on a weekly basis.
 3. Administration will walk through classrooms to ensure lessons planned in collaborative sessions are implemented with fidelity in and throughout classrooms. Feedback will be given to coaches based on walkthrough data. Team feedback will be given as well based on walkthrough data.
 4. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and PLC administrator and PLC lead will report progress on the area of focus.

Coaches:
 1. Coaches will monitor planning documents and give feedback to teams based on need.
 2. Coaches will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of implementation of instructional items discussed and planned during the PLTs. Feedback will be given to teams based on walkthrough data.
 3. Coaches will develop and implement a Tiered coaching plan based on the data and specific teams that need more support (as well as specific teachers needed more support).
 4. PLC Seven stages rubric will be used to measure Pre-Mid-End of school year progress of the PLTs. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the teams individually and collectively.

Teachers:

1. Walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor implementation of lessons planned.
- 2.. Feedback and walkthrough data will be provided to identify Tiered levels of teacher support needed.
3. Teachers will review and revise plans based on developed formative assessments and collaborative discussions. They will revised based on feedback from walkthrough data as well.
5. Student data will be monitored for expected increased based on plan implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Evidence suggests that teachers' work within successful PLCs improves instruction which may lead to improved student achievement (Lomos et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2013) and contribute to the effectiveness of schools (Louis et al., 2010; Hofman et al., 2015).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to Anntinluoma et al., (2021), the core idea of PLC recognizes the importance of teachers' collaboration outside their classrooms for school improvement, teachers' professional development, and student learning (Louis and Kruse, 1995; Slegers et al., 2013). Additionally, there is consensus that PLCs improve instruction by offering teachers and other staff members opportunities to reflect on and refine their instructional practices (Harris and Jones, 2010; Weissenrieder et al., 2015). Teachers refine their instructional practices through examination of evidence of student learning and examination of formative and summative assessment data.

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students and that collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction, produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities (Shapiro, 2008).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will construct and implement in-depth professional development on the elements of a Professional Learning Team, Building Norms for the team, creation of agendas for the team, and other elements that make up the professional learning community process. The training will include how to build lessons and tasks based on essential standards/benchmarks, how to build formative assessments to adjust instruction based on student needs, how to build scaffolds within Tier I instruction based on formative assessment data, and how to build enrichment for students that show mastery of the selected benchmark. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year based on needs reflected in monitoring data.

Person Responsible

Nadia Winston (nadia.winston@osceolaschools.net)

Support will be provided by content level coaches at each Professional Learning team meeting to ensure fidelity and instructional support (lesson demonstrations, content specifications and support, formative assessment development, AVID and WICOR strategy incorporation in lessons, scaffold creation and incorporation in Tier I lessons, etc.).

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

PLT facilitator meetings will be held monthly by PLT administrator and PLT lead to mentor and support facilitators with implementation of expected processes and strategies for highly effective teams. Trends and seven stages data will be analyzed to determine facilitators and/or teams needing more support.

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

PLTs will meet 4 times a month during early release and more times during the week as determined by teams, to focus on working collaborative for student success purposes.

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

Current data will be used by each PLT to assess, analyze, reflect upon, and revise plans (if needed) on the course progression of individual students' needs.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

School 2021-22 data found that 31% of students were proficient in ELA. Action is essential to accomplish the goal of attaining higher achievement of all students in the area of Literacy.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA proficiency and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

Administration:

1. Administrators will monitor ELA coach schedules to ensure support in PLT time frames and classroom (including scheduled coaching cycles based on Tiered teacher system).
2. Administration will monitor submitted ELA planning documents to ensure time is being use effectively and elements of the plan are covered.
3. Administration will walk through classrooms and calibrate data with coach to ensure fidelity in and throughout classrooms and to monitor needed support.
4. Feedback will be given to ELA coache based on walkthrough data and next steps discussed based on Tiered systems of support for teachers.
5. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and ELA coach will report progress on the area of focus.

Coaches:

1. ELA coach will monitor planning documents and give feedback to teams based on need.
2. ELA coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of implementation of instructional items discussed and planned during the PLTs. Feedback will be given to teams based on walkthrough data.
3. ELA coach will develop and implement a Tiered coaching plan based on the data and specific teams that need more support (as well as specific teachers needed more support).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers:

1. Walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor implementation of lessons planned.
- 2.. Feedback and walkthrough data will be provided to identify Tiered levels of teacher support needed.
3. Teachers will review and revise plans based on developed formative assessments and collaborative discussions. They will revised based on feedback from walkthrough data as well.
4. Student data will be monitored for expected increases on formative assessments based on plan implementation. Data will be analyzed for needed interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda DeRight (amanda.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Precision in teaching (which comes when teachers have an extensive knowledge base and make expert decisions, based on data, about the instructional needs of their students) is essential to improving literacy achievement for all groups of students (Fullan et al., 2006). The combination of small-group and effective classroom instruction results in higher levels of achievement for students who struggle with literacy (Mathes et al., 2005).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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 being provided with “the most personalized and engaging instruction possible” focused on the essential skills for their grade level (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2020).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PLTs will work together to analyze and respond to student data/work. They will create Common Formative Assessments (CFA's) to monitor progress towards proficiency between assessments. Teams will use rubrics to assess student work on open ended responses.

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

Professional development will be led by coaches in which teams will unpack essential standards to determine student evidence of mastery at the level of the standard. Teams will plan to provide intervention and enrichment based on student data/work.

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

Coaches will support teachers' use of effective instructional strategies including shifting the academic load to students, scaffolding, collaboration, writing to learn, and levels of questioning. This will include support in the utilization of high-quality ELA instructional materials and Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPs).

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

Open Court curriculum will be implemented in grades K-2 to support foundational literacy skills development.

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

Coaches will monitor teacher implementation of tier 2 and tier 3 instruction. Teachers will use common formative assessments for tier 2 progress monitoring. This includes instruction using Lexia Core 5, RISE reading program, Pre-Teaching strategies and other targeted interventions.

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

Teachers will meet regularly as a PLT to analyze data to make decisions about student moves for Tier 2 and Tier 3 , as well as meet with MTSS coach weekly/bi-weekly to review student data and interventions to determine effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1,2, and 3 students.

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

Designated meetings between the VE and classroom teacher for planning and data analysis. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist (or Elementary Education Specialist) and Resource Compliance Specialist (RCS) ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing professional development.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The 2021-2022 school data found that only 28% of students were proficient in math. Action is needed to ensure the goal of higher levels of mathematic achievement for all groups of students.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math proficiency and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration:

1. Administrators will monitor Math coach schedules to ensure support in PLT time frames and classroom (including scheduled coaching cycles based on Tiered teacher system).
2. Administration will monitor submitted Math planning documents to ensure time is being use effectively and elements of the plan are covered.
3. Administration will walk through classrooms and calibrate data with coach to ensure fidelity in and throughout classrooms and to monitor needed support.
4. Feedback will be given to Math coach based on walkthrough data and next steps discussed based on Tiered systems of support for teachers.
5. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and Math coach will report progress on the area of focus.

Coaches:

1. Math coach will monitor planning documents and give feedback to teams based on need.
2. Math coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of implementation of instructional items discussed and planned during the PLTs. Feedback will be given to teams based on walkthrough data.
3. Math coach will develop and implement a Tiered coaching plan based on the data and specific teams that need more support (as well as specific teachers needed more support).
- 4.. Math coach will monitor the use of questioning and mathematical discourse in the classroom that assists in the development of appropriate stages of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions will reflect Costa’s higher levels of questioning (Inquiry).

Teachers:

1. Walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor implementation of lessons planned.
- 2.. Feedback and walkthrough data will be provided to identify Tiered levels of teacher support needed.
3. Teachers will review and revise plans based on developed formative assessments and collaborative discussions. They will revised based on feedback from walkthrough data as well.
- 4.. Student data will be monitored for expected increases on formative assessments based on plan implementation. Data will be reviewed and analyzed for intervention needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hajian (michelle.hajian@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Tier I math instruction will include a focused on mathematical procedural fluency to support mathematical competency. The use of manipulatives, collaborative practices, scaffolding and other strategies will be implemented to support skill development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Mathematics fact fluency refers to the ability to recall facts in the area of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division (Multi-Rao & Plati, 2015). Arnold (2012) suggested that both fluency and automaticity are essential in student’s mathematic success as they play a critical role in helping students succeed with problem-solving. Just as decoding strategies are taught to improve reading skills, students need to be taught strategies to help improve mathematic fact fluency at the early stages of education. If students struggle with recalling their math facts, they often find other areas of mathematics too challenging and give up because the work begins to take too long and begin to experience anxiety when expected to solve problems that they believe are too strenuous (Parkhurst et al., 2010).

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.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PLTs will work together to analyze and respond to student data/work. They will create Common Formative Assessments (CFA’s) to monitor progress towards proficiency between assessments. Teams will use rubrics to assess student work on open ended responses.

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

Professional development will be led by coaches in which teams will unpack essential math benchmarks/standards to determine student evidence of mastery at the depth of the standard. Teams will plan to provide intervention and enrichment based on student data/work. (Planning will include the development of a problem of the week focused on fluency benchmarks for the respective grade level).

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

Coaches will support teachers' use of effective instructional strategies including shifting the academic load to students, scaffolding, collaboration, writing to learn, and levels of questioning. This will include support in the utilization of high-quality Math instructional materials and Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPs).

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

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of mathematical fluency across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTRs).

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

Teachers will meet regularly as a PLT to analyze data to make decisions about student moves for Tier 2 and Tier 3 , as well as meet with MTSS coach weekly/bi-weekly to review student data and interventions to determine effectiveness of academic math support for Tier 1,2, and 3 students.

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

ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

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

Supplemental learning opportunities will be provided to students who are identified as lacking in proficiency in mathematics or who are at risk based on progress monitoring data. Enrichment opportunities will also be provided to advanced students (based on data) to extend learning.

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

Teachers will use developed formative assessment data to identify students needs related to grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted support using Hand2Mind Numbers and Operations Intervention, Numeracy Project processes and program, and other research based interventions.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Recent evidence points to the early elementary grades as a pivotal point for the development of science learning trajectories and achievement gaps. One potential mechanism for improving early elementary science outcomes is an emphasis on the prevalence and content of science instruction (Curran & Kitchin, 2019).

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

2021-2022 Science data shows 18% proficiency. Science proficiency will increase by 5%.

Administration:

1. Administrators will monitor Math/science coach schedules to ensure support in PLT time frames and classroom (including scheduled coaching cycles based on Tiered teacher system).
2. Administration will monitor submitted science planning documents to ensure time is being use effectively and elements of the plan are covered.
3. Administration will walk through classrooms and calibrate data with coach to ensure fidelity in and throughout classrooms and to monitor needed support.
4. Feedback will be given to Math/science coach based on walkthrough data and next steps discussed based on Tiered systems of support for teachers.
5. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and Math/science coach will report progress on the area of focus.

Coaches:

1. Math/Science coach will monitor planning documents and give feedback to teams based on need.
2. Math/Science coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of implementation of instructional items discussed and planned during the PLTs. Feedback will be given to teams based on walkthrough data.
3. Math/Science coach will develop and implement a Tiered coaching plan based on the data and specific teams that need more support (as well as specific teachers needed more support).
- 4.. Math/Science coach will monitor the use of questioning that reflect Costa's higher levels of questioning (Inquiry).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers:

1. Walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor implementation of lessons planned.
- 2.. Feedback and walkthrough data will be provided to identify Tiered levels of teacher support needed.
3. Teachers will review and revise plans based on developed formative assessments and collaborative discussions. They will revised based on feedback from walkthrough data as well.
4. Student data will be monitored for expected increases on formative assessments based on plan implementation. Data will be reviewed and analyzed

for intervention needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students will engage in hands-on science activities as well as participate in academic discourse and inquiry through high impact instructional strategies such as collaborative structures, science labs and projects, interactive notebooks, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research suggests the importance of hands-on and inquiry-based scientific instructional practices (Calabrese Barton, Koch, Contento, & Hagiwara, 2005; Cuevas, Lee, Hart, & Deaktor, 2005; Furtak, Seidel, Iverson, & Briggs, 2012; Minner, Levy, & Century, 2010; Schroeder, Scott, Tolson, Huang, & Lee, 2007). Academic discourse through collaborative structures support student understanding and synthesis of scientific concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development will be given to develop common understanding among teams for science instructional strategies and expectations. Professional development will also be implemented to increase teachers' content knowledge and understanding of STEM materials and planning for instruction.

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

Walkthroughs and observations will be conducted to note science instructional strategy implementation and evidence of student learning within the content area.

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

Coach will support teachers' use of effective instructional strategies including shifting the academic load to students, scaffolding, collaboration, writing to learn, and levels of questioning, use of appropriate resources, including STEM materials and interactive notebooks. This will include support in the utilization of high-quality science instructional materials and tasks within the Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPs).

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

Teachers will work collaboratively in PLTs to analyze and respond to student data/work. They will create Common Formative Assessments (CFA's) to monitor progress towards proficiency between assessments.

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

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to student achievement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Empirical evidence has confirmed that school climate is powerful in affecting students' academic achievement (Maxwell et al., 2017; Brand et al., 2008; Chen and Weikart, 2008; Collins and Parson, 2010). This climate-achievement relationship appears to be robust for students across different grades, backgrounds, and cultures (Gregory et al., 2007; Jia et al., 2009).

Various sub-factors of school climate have been found to exert a powerful impact on academic achievement. For example, academic emphasis (Hoy and Sabo, 1998; Goddard et al., 2000b), academic optimism (Smith and Hoy, 2007), and strong teacher-student relationships (Crosnoe et al., 2004; Tschannen-Moran et al., 2006) have been found to be particularly influential.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

2021-22 Student Panorama Survey showed 42% 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.

Panorama data will show an increase in students' sense of belonging by 10-15%.

2021-22 Staff Insight Survey percentile rank score was 44%. 2022-23 Staff Insight survey data will show an increase in the index percentile rank by 10%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to look for evidence of AVID instructional and engagement strategies and PBIS expectation implementation throughout classrooms. This includes student goal setting, student led conferences, and collaborative structures across classrooms.

2. Surveys will be analyzed to identify interventions that will support positive culture and climate throughout the school.

3. The leadership team will conduct a monthly Stocktake process to review PBIS implementation, behavior and attendance data across subgroups, and develop needed interventions based on analyzation of data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Kinder (dawn.kinder@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Schoolwide AVID and PBIS protocols will be adopted to support student academic focus and school safety. Teacher teams will develop visions and missions for their teams (aligned to schoolwide mission and vision). Classroom teachers will help students develop attainable goals that are aligned with schoolwide goals and will be monitored throughout the school year. Schoolwide activities that include student led conferences and support of the schoolwide mission and student diverse needs will be implemented to impact school climate and culture positively.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research suggests that students' psychological identification with positive school climate is a powerful variable influencing students' academic performance. Interventions could foster and support students' feeling of closeness to the school (Maxwell et al., 2017; Turner et al., 2014). Staff's perceptions of school climate significantly predicts students' academic achievement (Maxwell et al., 2017; Johnson and Stevens, 2006; Brand et al., 2008; MacNeil et al., 2009; Yang, 2014).

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Strengthening school connectedness and increasing positive perceptions of school climate (including activities which emphasize a shared mission of the school and removes barriers to psychological school membership), might have positive implications for students' academic achievement (Maxwell et al., 2017).

AVID Elementary focuses on specific characteristics to ensure a transformational system that is consistent with AVID core principles. The following AVID essentials are deemed critical for successful implementation in the elementary school: (a) instruction, (b) culture, (c) leadership, and (d) systems (AVID Center, n.d.a)

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students and their needs. This includes the identification and support of students' individual assets and passions.

Person Responsible Dawn Kinder (dawn.kinder@osceolaschools.net)

2. Professional development targeted at building relationships, cultural relevance, and collective efficacy. Also, professional development targeted at building understanding of school-wide PBIS expectations (including the use of Zones of Regulation, Morning Meetings, and ClassDojo) and of AVID strategies and protocols will be conducted.

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

3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning for collaboration during PLTs and implement structures during instructional time.

Person Responsible Dawn Kinder (dawn.kinder@osceolaschools.net)

4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through goal setting, data chats, and consensus/action planning. This includes exposure to college and career readiness lessons/ programs.

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

5. Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as elf-management, self-confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.

Person Responsible Dawn Kinder (dawn.kinder@osceolaschools.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In the 2021-22 school year, the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3 not on track to score a level 3 or above was 68%. Instructional practices to be enacted related to Reading/ ELA are:

1. Guided reading practices with the use of FCRR Student Center Activities (Visible Learning effect size -phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)
2. Open Court will be used to support phonemic awareness and Tier 1 foundational skills
3. Words Their Way (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate) will be used in small group intervention time to support phonemic awareness and vocabulary instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In the 2021-22 school year, 69% of students were not on track to pass the FSA statewide assessment.

1. Explicit Vocabulary Instruction (Visible Learning effect size -vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate) will be implemented during Tier I instruction time. Anita Archer's model of explicit vocabulary instruction will be implemented. This will be implemented universally for grades 3-5.
2. RISE/RISE UP accelerated intervention (Visible Learning effect size - small group learning: .47 promising) will be implemented in grades 3-5 for students who are below grade level.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the 2021-22 school year, 68% of students were not on track to pass the statewide assessment. By the end of the school year, the total amount of students not on track to pass the statewide assessment will be decreased by 23% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the 2021-22 school year, 69% of students were not on track to pass the statewide assessment. By the end of the school year, the total amount of students not on track to pass the statewide assessment will be decreased by 23% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Administration:

1. Administrators will monitor MTSS coach and ELA interventionist schedule to ensure support in schoolwide intervention time frames.
2. Administration will monitor the intervention plans and documents to ensure scaffolds and intervention time is being planned.
4. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and MTSS coach will report progress on the area of focus.

Coaches:

1. MTSS coach will monitor interventionist and teacher plans for student intervention based on data.
2. MTSS coaches will conduct classroom walkthroughs during intervention time to monitor fidelity of implementation of intervention plans.
3. MTSS coaches will develop and implement a plan to support teachers on specific intervention implementation based on the observation data.

Teachers:

1. Teachers will review, and revise intervention plans based on academic assessment data and observation.
2. Student data will be analyzed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dewar, Amber, amber.dewar@osceolaschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Suggestions listed above contain ESSA ratings and/or effect size. All suggestions listed above are aligned to the district's Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The combination of small-group and effective classroom instruction results in higher levels of achievement for students who struggle with literacy (Mathes et al., 2005). Students can accelerate by being provided with "the most personalized and engaging instruction possible" focused on the essential skills for their grade level (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2020).

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning-both the school coach and district experts will provide professional development on the programs listed above as needed for individual and groups of teachers.	Dewar, Amber, amber.dewar@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Coaching-The Literacy coach will support teachers and increase student achievement through modeling, data analysis and instructional planning. The coaching will include modeling of fidelity of the targeted programs and usage in small group and whole group instruction.	Wittko, Michelle, michelle.wittko@osceolaschools.net
Assessment-The Leadership team will support teams planning and implementation of interventions to identify areas of need and to adjust intervention based on the measure of student progress at or above the level of the standard. The assessments will be used to inform instructional decisions for whole group, small group and flexible group instruction.	Dewar, Amber, amber.dewar@osceolaschools.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 will be college and career ready"). 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 PLTs 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.

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

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.