

Volusia County Schools

Beachside Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	20

Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osceola/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Leigh Prokop M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Volusia 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	20

Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osceola/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Where students, staff, teachers, parents, and the community work together to make Osceola AWESOME!

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Osceola Elementary teachers, staff, parents and community members work together to help develop an AWESOME whole child. We strive to offer personalized learning activities that value character development along with meeting the demands of the rigorous Florida Standards.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bruner, Lynn	Principal	
Cleveland, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Green, Gay	Instructional Coach	
Smyth, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Via, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Dockery, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Gilbert, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	
Cleckler, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Fischer, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Lopez, Yahaira	Teacher, K-12	
Treur, Deb	Teacher, K-12	
Belfer, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	
Ferrari, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	66	70	57	65	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	5	8	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - Updated
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	9	17	9	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	2	3	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	56%	57%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	53%	48%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	73%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	65%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	43%	51%	47%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	57%	53%	63%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	66 (0)	66 (0)	70 (0)	57 (0)	65 (0)	70 (0)	394 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	8 ()	5 ()	8 ()	3 ()	4 ()	33 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)	11 (0)	20 (0)	45 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	10	32	29	12	38	35	13				

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
BLK	20			35	60						
MUL	36			36							
WHT	56	55	43	59	58	43	61				
FRL	44	47	39	44	53	45	44				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	19	11	28	35	33	27				
BLK	38	30		27	55	55	20				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	62	56	27	72	52	16	67				
FRL	55	46	13	61	50	37	65				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	19	21	15	39	33						
BLK	25	20	33	33	47	45					
WHT	67	62	53	84	69	47	78				
FRL	56	54	46	65	63	50	52				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA Lowest Quartile

- 2018 score was 20%, which was our lowest performance area
- 2019 score was 42%, which shows a 22% gain
- Trends: proficiency of students with disabilities, proficiency of African American students
- Students in both subgroups are not attending after school tutoring

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

Math Achievement

- Master schedule did not align between ESE/Intervention/General Education
- Lack of clarity overall regarding rigor of standard aligned instruction

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.

ELA Lowest Quartile

- Our students with disabilities is at a high percentage due to our neighboring schools not having ESE programs that meet the level of support for those identified students

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

ELA Lowest Quartile

- Monthly data chats with CLT and grade level teams around LQ students and action steps needed to monitor progress
- Periodically review and adjust ESE/Intervention/General Education schedules based on student data
- Provided tutoring services to students identified in lowest quartile

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

1. Attendance

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

1. ELA Lowest Quartile
2. Math Achievement
3. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 51% which was below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Standards Aligned ELA Instruction in order to improve overall proficiency for all students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase ELA Proficiency from 51% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Standards Aligned Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Teacher estimates of achievement has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate Differentiated PL on Standards Aligned Instruction 2. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data 3. Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment 4. Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction 5. Purchase additional resources to supplement Standards Aligned Instruction 6. Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum Nights on campus and at off-site locations 7. Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers and provide feedback 8. Implement Attendance Incentives 9. Implement a Campus Reading Incentive Program 10. Monitor Standards Aligned Instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback 11. Provide professional learning opportunities for staff on Standards Aligned Instruction
Person Responsible	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Collective Efficacy
Rationale	The results of our 5 Essential Survey revealed that the area of Collaborative Teachers showed a decline from 46% to 37% overall. Our SLT has decided to focus on Collective Efficacy in order to improve our school's climate and culture which will increase the overall proficiency for all students in academic areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the area of Collaborative Teachers from 37% to 60% using the 5 Essential Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities, which include PLC Meetings, Faculty Meetings, Core Leadership Team Meetings and Grade Level Meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Collective Efficacy has a 1.57 effect size according to John Hattie.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate PL on Collective Efficacy 2. Differentiated PL (Menu of Choices) 3. Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment 4. Conduct collaborative planning sessions 5. Purchase additional resources to support implementation of campus goals 6. Create a one-page document that shares our SIP Areas of Focus that will be displayed around campus and shared with all stakeholders 7. Create a PBIS Handbook that will be shared with all stakeholders 8. Monitor staff's usage of PBIS strategies and rewards identified in the PBIS Handbook through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs to provide feedback and follow up coaching when necessary 9. Create a staff Pineapple Wall/Chart that allows teachers to invite one another into their classrooms for informal observations 10. Provide Professional Learning opportunities to support collective efficacy and cultural initiatives
Person Responsible	Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Targeting Achievement of Subgroups
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that three of our subgroups, Students With Disabilities, Black/African American Students and Multiracial Students, fell below 41% proficiency. Our SLT has decided to target achievement of those three subgroups in order to improve overall proficiency for students in those subgroups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase ELA Proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 10% to 41%.</p> <p>Increase Math Proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 12% to 41%.</p> <p>Increase ELA Proficiency of Black/African American Students from 20% to 41%.</p> <p>Increase Math Proficiency of Black/African American Students from 35% to 41%.</p> <p>Increase ELA Proficiency of Multiracial Students from 36% to 41%.</p> <p>Increase Math Proficiency of Multiracial Students from 36% to 41%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate PL on Differentiated Instruction 2. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data 3. Review Lowest Quartile and Subgroup data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions/enrichment, ESE and ESOL support 4. Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment 5. Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction 6. Purchase additional resources to supplement Differentiated Instruction 7. Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum Nights on campus and at off-site locations 8. Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers and provide feedback 9. Implement Attendance Incentives 10. Monitor Differentiated Instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback 11. Provide tutoring to identified students based on data analysis
Person Responsible	Melissa Cleveland (mgclevel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 55% which was below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Standards Aligned Math Instruction in order to improve overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Proficiency from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher estimates of achievement has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate Differentiated PL on Standards Aligned Instruction 2. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data 3. Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment 4. Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction 5. Purchase additional resources to supplement Standards Aligned Instruction 6. Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum Nights on campus and at off-site locations 7. Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers and provide feedback 8. Implement Attendance Incentives 9. Monitor Standards Aligned Instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback 10. Provide professional learning opportunities for staff on Standards Aligned Instruction
Person Responsible	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Osceola Elementary School builds and sustains partnerships with the local community by holding the following events:

- * Meet the Teacher- Various extended day providers are invited to set up a booth to share information.
- * Open House- PTA sets up a booth to promote membership amongst parents, grandparents, business partners and community members. Volunteers and Business Partners are invited to assist with and set up booths to share information.
- * Volunteer/Business Partner Appreciation Breakfast-Osceola offers a breakfast to thank all our parents, grandparents, business partners, and community members who have supported our school throughout the school year.
- * Members of the Seabreeze football team visit the classrooms to read to students.
- * Family/Curriculum Nights held on campus and at off-site locations- Volunteers and Business Partners are invited to assist with and set up booths to share information.
- * Osceola has been adopted by Daytona Beach Hilton which has earned grants on behalf of Osceola.
- * Osceola Gives Back- an event to prepare fifth grade students to Give Back to the community in which they live by demonstrating necessary social skills for the work force.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

SEL

Osceola Elementary School offers a variety of SEL programs/opportunities including:

- Mentoring
- Daily SEL lessons (provided by the district)
- School wide Soft Skills Expectations (developed by Osceola staff)
- Monthly lessons with the Guidance Counselor

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:

- Student Mentoring Program
- Peer Mediation Program
- Crisis Training Program
- Suicide Prevention Program
- Bullying Program
- Girls on the Run Program

Nutrition Programs

Osceola Elementary School offers a variety of nutrition programs including:

- Free and Reduced Meal Plan
- Wellness Policy School Plan
- Nutrition and Wellness classes
- Health classes

- Personal Fitness classes
- Running Club
- Girls on the Run Program

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The District, in conjunction with the Head Start agency serving the community, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:

- Providing the opportunity for ongoing channels of communication with Head Start to facilitate coordination of programs and for shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.
- Assisting in the development of a systematic procedure for transferring, with parental consent, Head Start program records, for each participating child to the school in which such child will enroll.
- Collaborating and participating in joint Professional Development, including transition-related training for school staff and Head Start staff when feasible.
- Coordinating the services being provided by Head Start with services in elementary schools.
- Providing to the Head Start agency local public school policies, kindergarten registration and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families from Head Start.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school-based MTSS/SLT leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, PBIS Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress.

The school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school- based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS/SLT is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with RtI as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Osceola Elementary School offers students' career awareness opportunities through job shadowing opportunities, guest speakers from business and industry, and field trips to business and industry locations.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Collective Efficacy	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Targeting Achievement of Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00