

Volusia County Schools

Osteen 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Osteen Elementary School

500 DOYLE RD, Osteen, FL 32764

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

Demographics

Principal: Scott Lifvendahl

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Osteen Elementary School

500 DOYLE RD, Osteen, FL 32764

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osteen/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	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

The Osteen Elementary family of parents, teachers, and the community members are dedicated to the total development of each child in a positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everyone, everyday striving to excel in every way!

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
Bambrick, James	Principal	Instructional Leader that supports the collaboration of PLC's and provides opportunities for professional learning.
Figueroa, Laura	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader that provides the professional learning calendar and agendas. Facilitates and coordinates SLT meetings and Professional Learning opportunities for all faculty and staff.
Goodling, Roxanne	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Instructional Leader. Liaison between the School Leadership Team and the KG PLC Team.
Tramont, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Instructional Leader that liaison's information and teacher point of view between the School Leadership Team and her PLC.
Vazquez, Evette	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Instructional Leader. She coordinates information between the 2nd grade PLC and the School Leadership Team. She is also the SAC Chair coordinating SAC meetings and providing parents with opportunities to share thoughts and opinions on school decisions.
Brown, Robin	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Instructional Leader providing the point of view of her 4th grade team while incorporating the school goals and communicating School Leadership decisions.
Davis, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Instructional Leader that serves as a liaison for PLC and School Leadership Team.
Gold, Pauline	Teacher, ESE	ESE leader to ensure our data discussions include our students with disabilities and decisions always include inclusive practices.
West, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Intervention teacher and DLT to assist with data driven discussions about learning gains and ways to include technology for student engagement across campus activities.
Randall, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach with the focus on standards driven instruction and ensuring teachers are receiving the support needed to improve lessons and provide standards based instruction and assessments.

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	67	79	89	78	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	14	15	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

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

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/31/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	65%	56%	57%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	53%	36%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	62%	54%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	43%	51%	45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	57%	53%	67%	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	67 (0)	79 (0)	89 (0)	78 (0)	80 (0)	96 (0)	489 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 ()	7 ()	14 ()	15 ()	17 ()	10 ()	75 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	10 (0)	33 (0)	44 (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	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
	2018	61%	58%	3%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	38	36	32	35	28	33	57				

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
ELL	50	58		41	50		54				
BLK	60	41		48	39						
HSP	61	62	41	56	55	46	77				
WHT	70	61	43	63	51	35	81				
FRL	61	56	42	56	47	32	69				
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	33	50	47	32	51	59	56				
ELL	45	50	42	47	55		40				
BLK	44	29		38	47		31				
HSP	49	42	38	51	46	44	35				
WHT	62	59	50	62	54	48	76				
FRL	52	49	39	54	51	51	60				
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	32	22	17	41	47	53	47				
ELL	38	30	30	48	50						
BLK	44	50		44	57		50				
HSP	51	33	29	52	34	29	52				
WHT	64	52	40	69	59	50	80				
FRL	53	48	42	58	54	55	63				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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	52
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.

Math Lowest Quartile demonstrated the lowest performance overall. The School Leadership Team discussed the need to build up common core math lessons. We see a deficiency in student ability with math facts fluency. Students with disability had a drop in their Math proficiency and we noted it was the need for a certified teacher in the additional unit received in November. We have hired a teacher for this school year and believe this will improve the student academic performance.

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

Math Lowest Quartile had a drop of 15 points from the prior year. The 4th grade group did not demonstrate the learning gains expected and 5th grade Math proficiency was not as expected. Overall, Math scores for 4th and 5th grade were lower and the discussion with the leadership team led to the lack of exposure to multiple strategies and teaching standards in depth and with rigor.

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.

Our Science proficiency was 24 points higher than the state and we believe that is attributed to the 5th grade Science teacher working closely with the intervention teacher. The intervention teacher was able to reinforce 3rd and 4th standards while the 5th grade teacher worked on the 5th grade curriculum.

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

Science State Standards Assessment had an increase of 15 points. There was an intervention teacher in 5th grade that worked on 3rd and 4th grade standards while the classroom teacher worked on 5th grade standards.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. We have made an attendance incentive for the school year to help students feel motivated to come to school.

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

1. Math Lowest Quartile
2. ELA Lowest Quartile
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Students with Disabilities
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve Math Learning Gains
Rationale	In analyzing our school data and report card our Math lowest quartile and Math learning gains were the only two areas that dropped. Our Math LQ dropped by 15% and only demonstrated 34% of our LQ students showing growth. Our SLT has decided that Math Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile need to be our area of focus for this school year with a focus on our students with disabilities. By improving our Math lowest quartile we will improve the achievement of students with disability that are in our lowest quartile.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve Math lowest quartile from 34% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Bambrick (jbambri@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	4th and 5th grade intervention teachers will use small group to provide standards based instruction and progress monitoring to ensure the closing of gaps in Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention teachers will be able to focus on FSA data and reporting categories to provide small group intervention in specific standards and areas while the classroom teacher can teach the current Math curriculum. The students will be able to apply the intervention learning in the classroom experience.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify lowest quartile based on FSA data. 2. Create a Master Schedule that will facilitate intervention of lowest quartile and proper placement of ESE / ESOL students. 3. Intervention teachers will work with small groups of 6-8 students on standards based instruction. 4. Intervention teachers will progress monitor and adjust as needed based on data. 5. Academic Coach will work with classroom teachers in 4th and 5th grade to ensure Standards Based instruction in depth. 6. Professional Learning will be provided via ERPL, faculty meetings and PLC's to increase Math proficiency in using Math curriculum and exposing students to multiple strategies when solving Math equations.
Person Responsible	Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Improve ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Although our ELA learning gains improved overall our lowest quartile only demonstrated 40% of the students demonstrating learning gains. We would like to see that area improve overall to demonstrate stronger learning gains for our lowest quartile of students which includes students with disability which also had a drop from 2018 - 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve ELA lowest quartile from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Bambrick (jbambri@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher led small group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction provides teachers the opportunity to closely monitor the learning of a student and provide immediate and impactful intervention while teaching the grade level standards.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify lowest quartile students based on FSA data. 2. Create a master schedule that will facilitate the proper time to create small group into the ELA block. to work with daily. 3. Using standards based curriculum identify areas of weakness 4. Use progress monitoring to identify improvement in those areas 5. Academic Coach will work with 4th and 5th grade ELA teachers to ensure Standards Based Instruction in depth. 6. Professional Learning via PLCs, ERPLs, and faculty meetings on using the new curriculum with in depth focus on the standards.
Person Responsible	Patricia Randall (prandall@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).

Attendance is an area of concern and we have our Parent Liaison working with the Guidance Counselor to improve attendance for the school.

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.

We plan to have parenting events that will provide community resources while also providing academic lessons that can help parents with helping the students at home.

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.

Our Guidance Counselor has weekly groups based on the needs of students. However, we also have Social Emotional time built into the master calendar for the first 15 minutes of the day and our Media Specialist provides SEL lessons through Enrichment Wednesdays every week.

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

New students are paired with peer classmates to help them get to know the school and the school expectations and rules. AP tries to stop in and visit with every new student to give them a welcoming environment and set the tone for the Osteen Way.

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 Leadership is comprised of a representative from each grade level as well as ESE, and our Academic Coach. The Leadership team looks at school data to determine the resources necessary for students academic growth. The AP coordinates with Title I to ensure resources are available for students.

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

Our Guidance Counselor is able to bring in Daytona State to speak with our families about services they provide for adults advancing education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Math Learning Gains	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00