Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Michigan Avenue Elementary School

2015 S MICHIGAN AVE, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crook-Nichols, Diane	Principal	School Leader
Williams, Erin	Assistant Principal	School Leader
Whetstone, Amy	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Scherer, George	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Ballesteros, Ximena	School Counselor	Mental Health Support for students
Sroka, Michelle	Staffing Specialist	Ensuring all students with special needs receive supports, accommodations are being followed, conducts annual reviews, and attends staffing meetings for students evaluated by the School Psychologist to determine qualification for ESE program.
	Instructional Media	Work in elementary schools to show students how to conduct research using resources from various forms of media. Assist teachers in creating lesson plans. Teach classes, coordinate meetings with book publishers, plan story times or book talks, and hold book fairs. Promote the media program to employees and students. Develop and maintain a comprehensive and efficient cataloging and inventorying materials in the media center.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Improvement Plan is presented to the School Advisory Council at the beginning of the year for feedback and review. A copy of the SIP is provided to each SAC member prior to the August SAC meeting (first meeting of the new school year). Members are asked to review the SIP and provided feedback on the goals and strategies established. During the August meeting, members collaborate in small groups and share their feedback. Feedback, including suggested strategies shared, are added/included in the SIP plan after receiving a majority vote. The SIP plan is a living document that is reviewed and revised during the school year. It is reviewed in August and December (mid-year).

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The team participates in monthly Stocktake meetings that update the SIP and review progress on our school goals. Prior to the Stocktake meeting, Instructional Coaches and Assistant Principal meet to review previous action steps and determine areas of need to move toward goals. The AP then meets with the Principal prior to the meeting to share concerns and allow for brainstorming to address the barriers. During the actual Stocktake process, the Leadership team presents progress and current challenges. The team determines a course of action and documents next steps.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	23	27	31	16	18	15	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	10	15	10	31	10	9	0	0	0	85
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	4	13	18	24	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	8	10	12	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	30	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	33	27	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	75	53	51	60	45	0	0	0	299

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	6	10	21	18	0	0	0	59

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	6	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	42	25	19	25	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	11	7	15	10	10	23	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	7	10	10	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	4	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	19	28	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	38	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	17	21	20	11	27	0	0	0	102

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	11	9	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	42	25	19	25	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	11	7	15	10	10	23	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	7	10	10	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	4	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	19	28	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	38	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	17	21	20	11	27	0	0	0	102

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	11	9	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	3	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	44	53	56	48	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				59			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			46		
Math Achievement*	61	46	59	57	44	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				61			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			34		
Science Achievement*	60	43	54	41	46	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	49	59	59	65			72		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	4	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	66			
HSP	47			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	66			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			61			60					49
SWD	20			28			20				5	29
ELL	36			43			43				5	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	75			56							2	
HSP	42			52			52				5	50
MUL	38			46							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	63			73			71				4	
FRL	44			53			53				5	47

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	59	43	57	61	36	41					65
SWD	22	50	47	28	39	22	22					
ELL	46	59	46	47	60	43	28					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	90		8	10							
HSP	47	48	25	51	66	49	29					67
MUL	69			54								
PAC												
WHT	66	68	61	67	61	27	53					
FRL	47	54	45	49	56	33	32					61

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	50	46	52	57	34	49					72
SWD	23	47	42	24	47	30	29					
ELL	25	26	25	30	50	55	5					72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			35								
HSP	45	44	33	41	53	50	40					76
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	60		65	66		67					
FRL	37	38	48	40	48	38	37					68

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or
all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	48%	20%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	41%	20%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	40%	16%	51%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

For the 2022-2023 school year, Michigan Avenue Elementary had a proficiency score of 55% in ELA. This is a 1% decrease from the 2021-22 school year. Factors and trends which contribute to last year's low performance include:
Trends: Identified factors that cause reading readiness deficiency noted at MAES include an increase in families with a low socio-economic background, mental imbalance, and lack of interest in reading for pleasure. The test structure was also different from the previous year. Students were given only one session to complete the exam which required more stamina. In previous years, students took two reading sessions. Additionally, a computer-based test was given to students rather than paper-based.

We teach students to read and annotate text using paper materials therefore this is a learning curve as students transition to taking the exam via a computer.

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

None of our data declined. All areas of data showed an increase.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

MAE met and/or exceed the state average in ELA, Math, and Science.
MAE met the state average for ELA at 55%. The state average is 55% in ELA. We did not exceed the state average, however we did meet the state average. In 3rd Grade ELA, we were at or near the proficiency standard in Literary Elements, Argument, and Comparative Reading, but the state was proficient. The state was also proficient in 3rd grade poetry, but we were below the proficiency level in that area. In 4th Grade ELA, we were at or near the proficiency standard in Structure and Context and Connotation, but the state was proficient. In 5th Grade ELA, we were at or near the proficiency standard in Perspective and Point of View, Theme, Structure, and Comparative Reading, but the state was proficient. The state was also proficient in 5th grade Literary Elements, Argument, Central Idea, and Paraphrase and Summarize, but we were below the proficiency level in that area.

Trends: Identified factors that cause reading readiness deficiency noted at MAES include an increase in families with a low socio-economic background, mental imbalance, and lack of interest in reading for pleasure.

ELA scores from PM 2 and PM 3 skewed lower for third grade, which we believe affected our overall average.

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

MAE improved from 41% proficiency to 59% proficiency in science.

We had high impact teachers that provided rigorous instruction in science. We also targeted bubble students based off NWEA and the mock science assessments. Using the CIMS Model those bubble students were provided with targeted instruction to provide them support for success.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance continues to be a concern for Michigan Avenue Elementary. Students arriving late and picked up early from school are potential areas of concern. We are working to minimize excessive absences through the increased feeling of belonging at school for students.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Empowering families
3. Goal setting and progress monitoring
4. Implementation of CIM
5. Implementation of gradual release model (I DO, WE DO, YOU DO)

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the 2022-2023 school year, Michigan Avenue Elementary had a 55% proficiency rate in ELA.

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Michigan Avenue will show 62% proficiency in ELA based on the PM 3 on the FAST. We will increase the outcomes for SWD from 22% to 41%.

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

The team will meet for Stocktake meetings once each month. During these meetings, we will review relevant data, the results of assessments, and walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Whetstone (amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Michigan Avenue Elementary will utilize Open Court, Benchmark Advance, Magnetic Reading, Lexia, and Accelerated Reading to ensure that students have access to a variety of programs that will engage and encourage reading achievement.

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

We will use Open Court to support reading foundational skills. Open Court has an ESSA Rating of Strong. Lexia Core 5 has an ESSA rating of Promising. The FLDOE's review of instructional materials percent of alignment for our core reading curriculum, Benchmark Advance, is as follows: K-96.78%, 1st-100%, 2nd-85.94%, 3rd-81.25%, 4th-79.68%, and 5th-95.31%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: Training will be complete by October 31, 2023.

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

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

By When: May 2024

3. Staff will utilize high quality, research-based ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans and the decision tree.

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

By When: September 2023

4. Tier II students will participate in the CIMS model and/or preteaching strategies to identify needs and previewing new concepts.

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

By When: May 2024

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL Compliance Specialists 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)

By When: October 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
Given the 2022-23 school data finding that 64% of students were proficient in Math. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for ALL students. When analyzing the data, it was identified that SWD and BLK students were proficient at only 28% and 8% respectively.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Math proficiency will improvement by 10% (from 64% to 74%). Increasing proficiency for SWD students from 28% to at least 35% and BLK students from 8% to at least 35% will contribute to the 10% increase goal for all students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Data from the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in the winter and spring will be used to monitor student proficiency. 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 Costas higher levels of questions (Inquiry). Schools 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 Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply to procedurers accurately, efficiently, and flexibly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure to a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and 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 judgements about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, common situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 with Math Coach will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for the unit of study. 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)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year (August 2023 - May 2024), specifically with PLTs meeting on a bi-weekly basis with Math Coach.

The Math Coach will co-plan and model lessons with fluency as a focus.
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 philosophical chair or error analysis (Inquiry; MTR 6).

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

By When: On-going fhrought the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to share their strategies and refine their thinking of fluency benchmarks by utilizing placement concenus (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 students (Osceola Numeracy Project or Hand2Mind Numbers & Operations Interventions) 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 a 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)

By When: The leadership team will monitor Tier 1 instruction by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs and providing immediate actionable feedback to individual teachers.

For Tier 2 and 3 students, progress monitoring will occur monthly with data being reviewed by the MTSS committee and interventions adjusted as needed.

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

By When: Ongoing monthly review at the end of each month.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, our student belonging score based on the Panorama Survey was 67% of students feel like they belong here at Michigan Avenue Elementary

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the goal is that 70% of students indicate that they feel like they belong at Michigan Avenue Elementary.

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

Panorama is given twice each year. The first assessment is in September and the second is in March.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

School counselors will offer both individual and small group sessions to provide extra support to students. New students will be targeted and invited to be a part of Michigan Avenue and welcomed to join activities. When students are struggling with conflict resolution, the school counselors will intervene with Second Step and Safe and Healthy Schools to help students build the skills to work together and collaborate. These lessons are offered in the whole group class setting and in small groups. Counselors also use these lessons to guide individual sessions.

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

Second Step and Safe and Healthy Schools are both programs that have been found to support students in building positive peer relationships and conflict resolution skills. Another program that is used to help students feel more successful and connected to the school is the Tough Kids Toolbox.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Mrs. Ballesteros, School Counselor, will collaborate with teachers and staff to plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students, identifying and building on students' individual assets and passion, on a monthly basis. The school-wide activity will be shared with everyone through the guidance department (via Mrs. Ballesteros). For example, students will be rewarded for Safe, Kind, and Responsible behaviors by being offered PBIS activities, such as Teacher Karaoke, Reindeer Games, and Shamrock Shenanigans.

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Activities will occur at least monthly, but throughout the school year.

The leadership team will intentionally plan to build an environment of belonging through positive school activities (Teacher Karaoke, Parent and Family Nights, etc.) on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Events will happen monthly.

3. Teachers and the leadership team will increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time. School counselors will visit classrooms and teach lessons to improve student interactions and build a positive sense of community.

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: PLC meetings are held at least twice each month.

4. The leadership team will encourage and facilitate students shared decision-making through consensus/ action planning. Students are called upon to be student leaders to increase their feelings of belonging (Bullpup of the Month, Safety Patrol, Disney Musicals in Schools, Soccer, Golf, Chorus, etc.)

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023

5. All staff will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project based activities.

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Leadership team and teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness where applicable. School counselors will model techniques to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Ximena Ballesteros (ximena.ballesteros@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022-23 school data finding that 59% of students were proficient in Science. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Science achievement for ALL students.

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 6% (from 59% to 65%) specifically focused on increasing SWD (lowest subgroup from previous year) from 22% to 30%.

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

Administration, leadership team, coaching, and teachers 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, and 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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, particpate 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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Utilizing classroom observation trend data, professional development will be created that utilizes effective instructional practices such as AVID, ESE, and ELL strategies and offered to teachers through PLTs.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year (August 2023 - May 2024), specifically with PLTs meeting on a bi-weekly basis with Science Coach.

The leadership team will monitor Tier 1 instruction by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs and providing immediate actionable feedback to individual teachers.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year (August 2023 - May 2024), specifically with Science Coach regularly meeting with teachers identified on a weekly basis based off walkthrough data.

Instructional coaches will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students identified as not proficient in science or who are identified as at risk for becoming not proficient in science based on a variety of formative and summative assessments.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year (August 2023 - May 2024), specifically with PLTs meeting on a bi-weekly basis with Science Coach.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our Literacy Coach, Amy Whetstone, provides coaching and other professional development support that enables teachers to think reflectively about improving student learning and implementing various instructional programs and practices. She serves as a support person for content knowledge and resources.
Michigan Avenue Elementary School is a Title I school because more than 70% of the students meet poverty requirements. At our school we use Title I funds to:

Add a Math/Science coach to our staff.
Add 3 paraprofessionals to the classroom.
Purchase supplemental classroom materials and supplies.
Provide professional development for teachers.
Purchase supplemental software and technology equipment.
Conduct parental educational meetings/trainings/activities.

After analyzing the accountability components by subgroups, two subgroups fall below the 41% achievement level target; SWD and Black/African American in Mathematics and SWD in ELA. These subgroups will be monitored for growth throughout the year. Our Title I paras are being utilized during iii (Immediate Intensive Intervention) time schedule for each grade level. Intensive intervention requires time for planning and delivering individualized instruction, as well as time for collecting and analyzing progress monitoring and diagnostic data, developing intervention plans, and making changes to plans when needed. Our Instructional Coaches (Math and ELA) meet with teams to plan for instruction, analyze progress, and make changes to

flexible groups intended for specific skill growth.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

N/A

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

Results from our students in 3rd and 5th grade showed 50% of our students scoring below grade level (proficiency). Michigan Avenue Elementary School is focusing on building foundational skills for our students who are struggling with letters and sounds. We will incorporate Open Court in grades 3-5 to help fortify students and increase foundational and word analysis skills. Small group instruction will continue during the 90-minute reading block and during intervention time to target student needs. We will utilize the FCIM to monitor student needs.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students will show growth through progress monitoring and the application of the FCIM model. Teachers are flexible grouping to ensure that the needs of all students are met. Our goal is see 62% of our 3rd-5th grade students proficient in the area of ELA.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Students will participate in regular progress monitoring, at least once every two weeks, Teachers will meet with their Professional Learning Teams to ensure that flexible grouping is being used and they are addressing the individual student needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whetstone, Amy, amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

Michigan Avenue Elementary uses two primary curriculums to address the needs of students, Benchmark Advance and Open Court. Both programs are research based and the goal is to fortify foundational skills. The students will also participate in STAR testing, and the results will be shared among the grade levels. Michigan Avenue Elementary has requested the help of data specialist, Mr. Ashton Terry, to support our understanding of the breakdown of the data.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on the individual needs of students, teachers will work to place students into appropriate student groups. Mrs. Whetstone will also ensure that teachers and paraprofessionals have support in following the FCIM and maintaining the Instructional Focus calendar.

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
Teachers and paraprofessionals will participate in professional development that addresses incorporation of the FCIM and the application of the Instructional Focus Calendar.	Whetstone, Amy, amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net
Mr. Terry will provide professional development to ensure that teachers know how to read the STAR testing reports and how the data can be disaggregated to meet the needs of all students.	Williams, Erin, erin.williams@osceolaschools.net
Paraprofessionals are pushing in to 4th and 5th grade to support the student needs and ensure maximum benefit for students that are struggling with ELA skills.	Whetstone, Amy, amy.whetstone@osceolaschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

During the September 2023 SAC Meeting, Michigan Avenue Elementary School will present and discuss the SIP with all stakeholders to gather feedback. MAES will share fliers with students and post on school website and social media at least seven days prior to the meeting in English and Spanish to announce and invite stakeholders to participate and provide input. In addiiton, the school will provide translation services in Spanish, as well as translation of other meeting documents like the agenda. The SIP and meeting documents will be disseminated in the school's website, social media, and a hard copy will be available in the school's front office. The SIP's progress will be monitored during the December 2023 SAC Meeting by sharing data to evaluate the progress of the plan and effectiveness of the activities and determine if an ammendment is needed.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Michigan Avenue Elementary School plans to create a positive culture with parents, families, and stakeholders by providing several meetings throughout the school year for families to be involved in. The development of the school's Parent and Family Engagement Plan, PFEP Summary/brochure, School-Parent Compact, and use of PFEP Funds for improved academic achievement. The PFEP documentation will be made available in both English and Spanish at the school as well as on the website. Notifications will be disbursed from the school through REMIND, fliers and invitations at SAC meetings, parent/teacher meetings, social media, and website. Building capacity events will be held throughout the year inviting families to participate in learning activities, specific to academic goals.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Michigan Avenue Elementary School will implement a collaborative classroom model between the General Education and ESE classrooms to ensure that students have access to rigorous materials. The school will provide quality instruction to meet individual student needs. In fifth grade, teachers will be provided professional development in the area of writing to allow for maximum student achievement.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Michigan Avenue Elementary coordinates the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services, such as Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education, for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A, for the implementation of various professional development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III, for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; and Title IX, for the implementation and support of students and families in transition.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Michigan Avenue Elementary School ensures that student skills are improved outside the academic subject areas by providing several strategies, such as the integration of supplemental paraprofessional personnell to assist with high-needs intervention areas, and the employment of a tiered support system for students that is provided by targeted MTSS strategies and personnel.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Michigan Avenue Elementary School will have the opportunity to engage 5th grade students in enriching, supplemental STEAM curriculum on the district's mobile STEAM lab. This curriculum will provide an in-depth learning opportunity that will entice students to the several post-secondary options available to them through the fields of STEAM.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Michigan Avenue Elementary will establish a MTSS team to systematically monitor data, track student progress, and create and implement cohesive interventions to increase student achievement. As part of the tiered model, teachers will utilize AVID strategies and research based materials.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Michigan Avenue Elementary School will implement a collaborative classroom model between the General Education and ESE classrooms to ensure that students have access to rigorous materials. The school will provide quality instruction to meet individual student needs. In fifth grade, teachers will be provided professional development in the area of writing to allow for maximum student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A