

Volusia County Schools

# Beachside Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# 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: 7/28/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">78%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">27%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
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	
French, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Leigh Prokop M

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

32

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	44	61	55	64	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	6	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	4	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 7/28/2020

**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	
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	

**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	
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	

**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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.**

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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	

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

## 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

-While this was our lowest performance area it was also the area that showed the most improvement in part due to these contributing factors:

- 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

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

Math Achievement

-Standards assessed on iReady do not align with curriculum map

**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?**

Attendance and Referrals/Suspensions

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

1. Math Achievement
2. ELA Achievement
3. Referrals/Suspensions
4. Attendance.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed Math proficiency was 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.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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. We used district curriculum maps that address the state standards to select this strategy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate Differentiated PL on Standards Aligned Instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Purchase additional resources to supplement Standards Aligned Instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum Nights on campus and at off-site locations

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers and provide feedback

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor Standards Aligned Instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)



Provide professional learning opportunities for staff on Standards Aligned Instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our Needs Assessment 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.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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. We used district curriculum maps that address the state standards to select this strategy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate Differentiated PL on Standards Aligned Instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Purchase additional resources to supplement Standards Aligned Instruction

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum Nights on campus and at off-site locations

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers and provide feedback

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue a Campus Reading Incentive Program

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor Standards Aligned Instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that 21 of our students or 6% of our student population, have 2 or more EWS indicators. Our SLT has decided to focus on reducing the number of students with 2 or more EWS indicators.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the number of students with 2 or more EWS indicators from 6% to 3%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PBIS

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Behavioral intervention programs have a .62 effect size according to John Hattie.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate Differentiated PL on PBIS strategies

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning sessions for academics and SEL

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Purchase additional resources to support implementation of campus goals

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Update the PBIS Handbook and share it with all stakeholders

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Investigate creating student clubs to increase student achievement

**Person Responsible** Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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

- \* Meet the Teacher- Information from various extended day providers will share information via social media, the school website and weekly communication from administration.
- \* Open House- PTA will virtually promote membership amongst parents, grandparents, business partners and community members. Volunteers and Business Partners will share information via social media, the school website and weekly communication from administration.
- \* 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 if CDC guidelines allow. If necessary, virtual celebrations will be held.
- \* Family/Curriculum Nights held on campus and at off-site locations if CDC guidelines allow- Volunteers and Business Partners are invited to share information. If necessary, nights will be held virtually.
- \* 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 if CDC guidelines allow.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>