

St. Johns County School District

Osceola 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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Jessley Hathaway

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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 PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Osceola Elementary will be a family of learners working to become successful in academic and social settings. By nurturing determination, grit, and a growth mindset in all students, we will create life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Better Never Quits

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
Waldrop, Tina	Principal	
Evans, Stephanie	Other	
Jenkins, Faye	Other	
Keffer, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Harrison, Dana	School Counselor	

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	99	112	106	83	97	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	11	19	17	11	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
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	4	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	1	0	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	6	10	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	24	34	9	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	4	3	0	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	13	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	4	2	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	24	34	9	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	4	3	0	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	13	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	4	2	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	64%	75%	57%	52%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	67%	58%	51%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	59%	53%	38%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	77%	63%	64%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	69%	62%	69%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	59%	51%	62%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	72%	53%	55%	69%	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	99 (0)	112 (0)	106 (0)	83 (0)	97 (0)	121 (0)	618 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (24)	19 (34)	17 (9)	11 (17)	14 (11)	20 (10)	92 (105)
One or more suspensions	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (8)	0 (8)	0 (2)	0 (25)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (6)	19 (13)	17 (36)	40 (55)

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	57%	78%	-21%	58%	-1%
	2018	64%	78%	-14%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	77%	-6%	58%	13%
	2018	43%	74%	-31%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	58%	76%	-18%	56%	2%
	2018	43%	73%	-30%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	82%	-20%	62%	0%
	2018	68%	80%	-12%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
	2018	62%	83%	-21%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	67%	80%	-13%	60%	7%
	2018	43%	79%	-36%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	73%	-17%	53%	3%
	2018	47%	73%	-26%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	56	51	44	67	68	33				
BLK	50	69	64	59	74	56	44				
HSP	73	59		67	80						
WHT	66	67	54	75	74	76	69				
FRL	52	65	53	63	74	73	49				
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	27	23	19	37	28	11	17				
BLK	27	30	25	42	28	9	16				
HSP	63	40		63	47						
MUL	57	30		64	50						
WHT	61	38	23	67	44	19	60				
FRL	43	30	26	51	36	15	36				

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	21	46	48	35	54	45	27				
BLK	26	27	18	45	61	53	14				
HSP	63	68		53	68		55				
MUL	67			60							
WHT	59	56	61	73	70	67	68				
FRL	40	41	36	57	62	57	42				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	70
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	69
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	61
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.

The proficiency level for third grade in both reading and math declined by 7% in ELA and 6% in math. Some of the contributing factors were the newness of teachers to the grade level curriculum and the school community. This is not a trend. for the previous school year, the ELA proficiency was 64% and math was 68%.

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

The proficiency level in both ELA and math declined in third grade from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year. With teachers new to the grade level curriculum and expectations, this factor played a role in the decline in proficiency levels.

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.

While the data for lowest quartile in ELA is greater than the state average, it is the closest to the state percentage. Our ELA gains for the lowest quartile was 57% and the state average was 53%.

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

The area with the most improvement was the learning gains for the lowest quartile in math. For the 2017-2018 school year, the math gains percentage for the lowest quartile was 17%. For the 2018-2019 school year, the percentage increased to 74%. For the 2018-2019 school year, a math coach was hired to work with the lowest quartile students on a daily basis. A focused tutoring program for the lowest quartile was developed as an additional support system for these students.

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

Increasing the overall attendance of students who have had more than average attendance rates. Traditionally the attendance of kindergarten and first grade students has been a concern. We will work with our families of these grade levels to educate them on the importance of school attendance.

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

1. Student growth on FSA assessments, specifically the growth of the lowest 25%
2. Number of students scoring level 1 and 2 on state assessments
3. Attendance of Kindergarten and first grade students
4. Attendance overall
5. Number of students with 2 or more indicators

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase 3rd grade proficiency in ELA and Math
Rationale	Our assessment results showed that the proficiency levels for third grade decreased by 7% in ELA and 6% in math. Using a highly effective teacher interventionist in ELA and the math coach, we will improve proficiency levels for both math and ELA in third grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase third grade FSA ELA proficiency from 57% to the 62%. We will increase third grade FSA math proficiency from 63% to 68%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	SIPPS assessment was used to create grade-level intervention groups. SIPPS, Phonics for Reading, and iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the hour long intervention block. The math coach will provide support to teachers and students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SIPPS and Phonics for Reading are research based multi-sensory phonics programs that increase student phonics proficiency. The Professional Learning Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The math coach provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations 2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in ELA and math using formative and summative assessments 3. Students have been placed in SIPPS with have continues monitoring following the fidelity of the program 4. Teams meet twice a week to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students
Person Responsible	Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase learning gains for lowest quartile in ELA
Rationale	Our assessment results showed that the embedded professional development for teachers in ELA and the support that was provided to students helped increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in 4th and 5th grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase the FSA ELA lowest 25% gains from 57% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	A phonics assessment was used to create grade-level intervention groups. SIPPS, Rewards, and iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the hour long intervention block. The interventionist will provide support to teachers and the lowest quartile of students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn. A spreadsheet is used to track student summative and iReady data as well as list any interventions that are in place for that individual. Teachers update this sheet after standards based summative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SIPPS and Rewards are research based multi-sensory phonics and comprehension programs that increase student proficiency. The Professional Learning Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The interventionist provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations 2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in ELA using formative and summative assessments 3. Students have been placed in SIPPS with have continues monitoring following the fidelity of the program 4. Teams meet twice a week to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students 5. Develop a spreadsheet for lowest quartile data to be discussed every 4 weeks in CORE team meetings
Person Responsible	Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase learning gains for lowest quartile in math
Rationale	Our assessment results showed that the embedded professional development for teachers in math and the support that was provided to students helped increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in 4th and 5th grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the 2020 FSA Math, the lowest 25th percentile of students will improve from 74% to 79%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the designated intervention block. The math coach will provide support to teachers and the lowest quartile of students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn. A spreadsheet is used to track student summative and iReady data as well as list any interventions that are in place for that individual. Teachers update this sheet after standards based summative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	iReady Next Steps are provided to teachers to differentiate to meet the needs of the students in their classroom. The Professional Learning Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The math coach provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations 2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in math using formative and summative assessments 3. Teams meet twice a week to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students 4. Develop a spreadsheet for lowest quartile data to be discussed every 4 weeks in CORE team meetings
Person Responsible	Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4

Title	Conscious Discipline implementation school-wide
Rationale	OES is a title 1 school that serves a population of students who experience difficult life situations. Our students have difficulty regulating their emotions and it often disrupts the classroom and results in students missing valuable learning time.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students will utilize the skills of composure to deescalate behaviors, reducing the number of behavior referrals and increasing time spent in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	In order to create a positive learning environment and reduce student behavior referrals in all grade levels, Osceola Elementary School will implement the strategies and tools for self-regulation and pro-social skills from the Social and Emotional model of Conscious Discipline. Data shows that the number of referrals we have written were for defiance and disrespect.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Conscious Discipline targets students that often become frustrated and unreachable. Using referrals, data will be tracked for students on behavior plans. It will also be tracked through RTI/MTSS.
Action Step	
Description	All classrooms will offer a safe place/area in their classrooms for students to manage their emotions. Teachers will practice breathing techniques with the students and use those techniques when appropriate/necessary. The administration team will offer support and training to teachers throughout the school year.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.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.

Parental Involvement is critical to the success of our Title 1 program. Jointly developed, our school distributes a school parental involvement policy to all families. Parents, teachers, and students sign our compact that focuses on shared responsibility for student achievement. These and other aspects of our Title 1 program are explained at our grade level Title 1 Curriculum Nights. The districts coordinates with the Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

For the 2019-2020 school year, a new focus on Conscious Discipline will be used school-wide. PBIS has been revamped to help meet the social and emotional needs with our students. Through small group and individual counseling, guidance services are offered focusing on targeted issues like bullying, career awareness, Character Counts week, and personal safety. Individual and group counseling is available, based on need, through a district Mental Health Counselor and through the Children's Home Society. A school Social Worker assists us with those families/students requiring home visits and assistance in targeting individual needs and strengthening the home-school connection. Osceola Elementary is partnering with other businesses/district employees as well as Big Brothers, Big Sisters to find positive one on one mentor-ships for our students.

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

In the Spring before the beginning of the school year, parents are invited to attend an evening Osceola Family Night. Parents are introduced to our Kindergarten faculty, given an opportunity to register their children and enjoy the family event. Kindergarten teachers will "screen" our Pre-Kindergarten students as they are registered this spring before starting kindergarten.

Through Head Start, the parents of our PreK children will have more contact with our school as part of Head Start's Parental Involvement Policies. Incentives will be offered to parents to encourage early registration/screening of these students so that they can be properly placed for the following school year. A transition to middle school SAC meeting is held at the end of every school year. The addition of a Math Instructional Coach will help support and prepare students for their transition to middle school. 5th Grade RJ Murray Visit. 5th Grade Scheduling with Murray Representative. Osceola and Murray representatives meet to hold transition meetings for students with IEPs and EPs.

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.

Teachers: Provide core instruction, participate in student data collection and implement Tier 2 interventions.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participate in student data collection, integrate instructional activities into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborate with teachers through activities and coteaching.

Intervention Specialist: Tracks data and provides research based intervention of lowest 25%.

Instructional Math Coach: Using observations and teacher need, provides coaching and PD helping

teachers implement the best instructional practices to support Math gains. Models math lessons and collaborates with the leadership team. Provides PLC support to collaborative teams.

Instructional Reading Coach: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based assessment and intervention approaches.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation;

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted during school, through after-school programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title II funds support the delivery of PD for the 19-20 year.

Title III Services provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

The Title IX District Homeless Liaison provides resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Violence Prevention Programs: The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that involve age-appropriate activities.

School-wide behavior plan

EPIC Community Services provides support

Nutrition Programs that partner with the University of Florida Extension program.

Head Start: Osceola has six Head Start/PreK/VPK blended classrooms.

Flagler College/UNF students

Big Brothers/Big Sisters

RSVP Volunteers

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

N/A