

School District of Osceola County, FL

Michigan 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Diane Crook Nichols

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Crook-Nichols, Diane	Principal	School Executive
Williams, Erin	Assistant Principal	School Executive
Scherer, George	Math Coach	Instructional leader in charge of Math and Science. Reviews and analyzes data.
Sroka, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Reviews and analyzes data and oversees the MTSS process.
Shiver, Amy	School Counselor	Analyzes data, supports student mental health and wellness needs.
Whetstone, Amy	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Ballesteros, Ximena	School Counselor	School Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/18/2012, Diane Crook Nichols

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.*

10

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.*

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Total number of students enrolled at the school

788

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

7

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

7

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	88	130	117	119	142	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	735
Attendance below 90 percent	35	42	25	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	11	7	15	10	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	17	21	20	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	0	1	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/15/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	8	11	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	8	11	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	56%	48%	56%				59%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						45%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	44%	50%				57%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						67%	59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						56%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	46%	59%				52%	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	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
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	22	50	47	28	39	22	22				
ELL	46	59	46	47	60	43	28				
BLK	42	90		8	10						
HSP	47	48	25	51	66	49	29				
MUL	69			54							
WHT	66	68	61	67	61	27	53				
FRL	47	54	45	49	56	33	32				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	47	42	24	47	30	29				
ELL	25	26	25	30	50	55	5				
BLK	29			35							
HSP	45	44	33	41	53	50	40				
WHT	56	60		65	66		67				
FRL	37	38	48	40	48	38	37				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	43	41	24	54	61	20				
ELL	34	47	41	40	58	57	33				
BLK	50	60		61	80						
HSP	48	51	50	50	64	59	44				
MUL	64			64	80						
WHT	69	55	40	64	68	50	62				
FRL	52	50	46	52	66	61	47				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
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?

Michigan Avenue Elementary had a drop in the learning gains for the Lowest Quartile in ELA, but there was a growth in the Lowest Quartile of Learning Gains in Math. Science had a significant drop of 9 percentage points.

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

The area with the greatest need for improvement is Science. MAES dropped 9 percentage points. We also saw a drop in the Lowest 25% Learning Gains in ELA.

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

Our focus this year is strong instruction, especially in Science. We are implementing a STEM Block for our 5th grade students that meets daily.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our school showed a 9% increase in the Learning Gains in ELA and 4% increase in the Learning Gains in Math.

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

Our school focused on ELA improvement last year through the use of the RISE program. Multiple grade levels provided small group instruction using RISE.

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

We need to have a continued focus on building science and literacy skills. As MAES is a one to one school, the goal is that students will have access to curriculum from home and at school. This will directly impact student achievement. Students will have access to weekly Science assessments that will be loaded into School City. The leadership team will then review the data and make necessary adjustments.

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.

This year we have two mentor teachers that are providing support to our newer teachers. These teachers only teach in a classroom setting half of the day and they are available to provide support to their team the other half of the day. They float in and out of the classrooms, model lessons, and provide planning support to ensure that standards based instruction is implemented.

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

MAES has planned multiple Parent and Family Engagement Activities including "Fall Into Literacy," a Math and Science family events, and the "Wax Museum" which encourages parents and students to become involved in activities after school. In addition to the family nights, we will also have tutoring opportunities for students and an additional hour of Professional Learning Community time added into each week.

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 ELA**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 shows that Michigan Avenue Elementary is 56% proficient in ELA. This is an increase from 50% in the previous school year.

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

The school goal is to increase proficiency and learning gains by 7%.

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and Literacy Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC weekly. Each leadership team member is assigned to a specific grade level.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
4. Students will conduct student led conferences at Parent Night to share progress with their families.
5. After school tutoring will be offered for additional intervention throughout the school year.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

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

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

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. All staff will be trained by the district and Literacy Coach in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

. Training by the Literacy Coach on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered throughout the year to struggling teachers.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and, scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@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. 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. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ word analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, prosody, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 and Tier 2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 - 1 day/week during station rotation.

Tier 3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 - 2 days/week during station rotation.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

RISE reading for all Tier 2 students. Pre-Teaching strategies for T2

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the 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 Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Meetings weekly/bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students.

Person Responsible Michelle Sroka (michelle.sroka@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

#2. 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.

Given the 2021-2022 school data finding that 57% of students were proficient in Math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Math proficiency will improve by 7%.

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

Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.

Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry).

School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure for a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and

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

problem-solving (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010; NCTM, 2000, 2014). All students need to have a deep and flexible knowledge of a variety of procedures, along with an ability to make critical judgments about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.

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.

Teachers will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study.

Students will be presented with a problem of the week focused on the fluency benchmarks for their grade level. Students will have an opportunity to share their strategy for solving the problem on sticky notes. At the end of the week, students from different classes will be selected to present their strategy to the entire grade (MTR 3).

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

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

The math coach will co-plan and model lessons with fluency as a focus.

Teachers will implement a fluency center that focuses on developing appropriate automaticity within the grade-level benchmarks through game-based learning.

Students will keep a journal to reflect on the strategies they are learning including an explanation of which strategies they prefer to use and when (Writing; MTR 3).

Teachers will use worked examples of different strategies for the fluency benchmarks and provide students the opportunity to engage in a philosophical chair or error analysis (Inquiry; MTR 6).

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

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to share their strategies and refine their thinking of fluency benchmarks by utilizing placemat consensus (Collaboration; MTR 4).

Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted remediation based on the identified needs of the student using (insert intervention programs such as Osceola Numeracy Project or Hand2Mind Numbers & Operations Intervention) resources.

Staff will teach problem-solving strategies and high-order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.

Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.

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

Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at risk of becoming non-proficient in mathematics based on a variety of progress monitoring.

Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that connect to a sequence of learning. Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high-quality questioning and discussion

techniques, supported by feedback and the ability to self-assess progress related to the outcome. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the 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. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2, & 3.

Meetings weekly/ bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for students.

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

#3. 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.

During the 2021-2002 school year, Science scores dropped from 50% proficiency to 41%.

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

Science proficiency will increase by 10%.

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

Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction.
Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs.
School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Scherer (george.scherer@osceolaschools.net)

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

Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures
Engage in active learning experiences
Process learning using interactive science notebooks

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

Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts (in ideal settings, without judgement and with a clear prompt and structure). WICOR (AVID)
Active learning experiences: Students who are “doing” are learning. Providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in experiments, develop models, and engage in simulations and activities remember the experience, especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives (which is possible in almost all science content). WICOR (AVID)
Interactive science notebooks: Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, data.

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.

Identify team members who will lead the needs assessment, planning, learning, and monitoring of science instructional practices.

Develop a common understanding among team members for each instructional strategy and expectations for what each looks like in the classroom.

Can focus on one strategy at a time, identifying priorities.

Revisit understanding and expectations of strategy monthly, sharing examples and non-examples.

Highlight good examples and incorporate into professional learning.

Conduct classroom walkthroughs, focusing on highest priority science instructional strategy. Walkthrough should be focused on student learning (not teacher facilitating). What are students doing? Can students describe what they are learning and why they are learning it?

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

Use data (formative assessments and progress monitoring) to discuss student learning gains and plan for professional learning and coaching needs.

Work with school- and district-based science team to develop professional learning that address areas of need specific to science instructional practice and strategies.

Identify and schedule dates for continuous cycle of learning which includes developing understanding of strategy, monitoring in instructional practice, needs assessment discussion, professional learning to address needs, implementation post professional learning through monitoring. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.

Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

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

#4. 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.

If teachers participate in authentic PLC's in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA, Math, and Science proficiency scores will increase by at least 7%. The goal in Science is a 10% increase.

Monitoring:

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

Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.

PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Williams (erin.williams@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

PLC is defined as an "ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve." (Dufour, 2006)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in an assumption that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. Consequently, student learning is both the foundation and evidence of an effective PLC.

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.

PLC teams will develop and implement formulated meeting Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during meetings.

Schools PLC's teams will meet four times a month during early release and this dedicated PLC time will be spent focused on working together as a team.

Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and PLC administrator.

Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and

revising plans progression of individual students' needs.

Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling. Each grade level will have an embedded leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process. Teachers will plan together within their PLCs to incorporate WICOR strategies and AVID strategies focused engagement for all.

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

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Belonging**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate better test scores and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions, mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges, and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop a positive culture they need to succeed in life.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase a students' sense of belonging by 10% based on the Panorama Survey that is administered to all students 3-5.

Monitoring:

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

All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive school culture and promote a sense of student belonging.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983)

Describe the

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

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. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning
8. Teachers and staff will plan for and implement an opportunity for exposure to post secondary learning.

Person

Responsible

Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@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

Teachers will utilize Open Court with fidelity, differentiate instruction through small groups, and incorporate flexible grouping during iii. Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) will be offered before/

after school, PE Waivers (during school), and RISE intervention groupings during iii will be implemented to maintain and accelerate grade level performance.

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

Teachers will utilize RISE and RISE Up groupings during iii and/or BLOCK (PE Waivers), match individual student needs to the interventions provided, differentiate instruction through small groups, utilize flexible grouping during iii, promote and monitor independent reading through the Accelerated Reader and Lexia programs.

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)

63% of the students in grades K-2nd grade will be proficient as determined by the Spring NSGRA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

63% of the students in grades 3rd - 5th grade will be proficient as determined by the Spring FAST and monitored using NSGRA data throughout the 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.

Monitoring will be ongoing with the Problem-Solving Team (PST) meeting weekly. Student performance will be monitored using NSGRA and FAST. Data chats will occur after each testing period. Teachers will create common assessments and meet weekly in PLCs to review data. This data will be used and reflected upon to form flexible groups during iii. In addition, our teachers will use this data to drive future instruction for each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whetstone, Amy, amy.whetstone@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?

Benchmark Education is the evidence-based reading program adopted in Osceola County.

Explicit, systematic, multi-modal instruction designed for Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction is based on the latest Science of Reading research. Unit topics are designed to build vocabulary and content knowledge, with application to reading and writing emphasized.

Focus on foundational skills (phonics and decoding) in K-2nd grades.

Focus on fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in 3rd - 5th grades.

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 researched based programs (Benchmark, RISE, RISE Up, Open Court) used are aligned to the BEST Standards and the K-12 Reading Plan. These evidence-based programs address the identified needs of each student and show proven record of effectiveness for a targeted population.

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
Form intervention groups based on needs according to data.	Sroka, Michelle, michelle.sroka@osceolaschools.net
Teachers will develop common assessments and analyze data to form flexible groups for small group instruction and iii. Monitor data to drive future instruction and flexible groups.	Whetstone, Amy, amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net
The Problem-Solving Team will meet weekly to discuss and analyze data and intervention plans.	Sroka, Michelle, michelle.sroka@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.

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

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high quality instruction, and holds staff responsible for implementing any changes. the school frequently communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: collaborative planning is solutions focused.

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

The stakeholders at Michigan Avenue include parents, students, staff members, and community members. We invite all to be a part of our School Advisory Council or our Parent Teacher Organization. Both of these groups reaches out to families and the community early and often.