

Volusia County Schools

Osteen Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	69%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lifvendahl, Scott	Principal	Provides leadership and administrative coordination of all instructional activities. Supervises the safety and security of all students along with the assistant principal. Monitors and offers feedback to build the instructional capacity of faculty members. Engages the input of all stakeholders to achieve the school goals and mission.
Baker, Joselyn	Assistant Principal	Supervises the safety and security of all students along with the principal. Monitors classroom instruction and provides feedback to build the instructional capacity of faculty members. Engages in the monitoring of the implementation of the Instructional Learning Plan of students with disabilities and the supports of students of speakers of other languages.
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.
Schneider, Naomi	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Schneider is a first-grade teacher and chair that leads a group of four teachers. She is part of the school leadership team and makes school-wide decisions.
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.
Corchado, Heidi	Instructional Media	Ms. Corchado is the Media Specialist for Osteen and leads the Special Area teachers. She is part of the school leadership team and makes school-wide decisions.
Goodling, Roxanne	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Instructional Leader. Liaison between the School Leadership Team and the KG PLC Team.
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.
Davis, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Instructional Leader that serves as a liaison for PLC and School Leadership Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Scott Lifvendahl

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

443

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	59	75	73	69	94	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	6	26	29	14	32	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	4	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	56%	57%	56%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	52%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	53%	40%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	59%	63%	56%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	56%	62%	52%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	43%	51%	49%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	57%	53%	62%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Tools for progress monitoring were three iReady Diagnostics administered for English Language Arts and Mathematics. These assessments took place in the Fall, Winter, and Spring. Additionally, district-created assessments were used for formative data to drive instruction.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65/24.62%	70/44.29%	77/64.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/27.66%	48/41.67%	49/69.39%
	Students With Disabilities	5/40%	4/0%	6/0%
	English Language Learners	9/0%	11/9.09%	10/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60/13.33%	62/32.26%	67/53.73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/18.60%	43/32.56%	45/51.11%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	4/0%	5/0%
	English Language Learners	9/0%	9/0%	9/45.75%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63/23.81%	71/39.44%	72/59.72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/25.49%	58/37.93%	57/57.89%
	Students With Disabilities	12/16.67%	13/0%	13/38.46%
	English Language Learners	10/10%	11/36.36%	11/45.45%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62/8.06%	65/27.69%	76/51.32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/10.20%	53/26.42%	61/49.18%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.18%	12/0%	13/23.08%
	English Language Learners	10/0%	10/10%	11/36.36%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/53.19%	96/68.75%	109/75.23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/52.63%	76/69.74%	85/74.12%
	Students With Disabilities	21/19.05%	24/37.50%	21/71.43%
	English Language Learners	15/80%	15/80%	21/85.71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83/15.66%	92/35.87%	82/59.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/19.40%	73/32.88%	63/57.14%
	Students With Disabilities	17/5.88%	19/36.84%	16/43.75%
	English Language Learners	15/6.67%	16/18.75%	14/50%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75/28.%	72/43.06%	74/45.95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/26.92%	50/44%	50/48%
	Students With Disabilities	22/9.09%	24/16.67%	24/8.33%
	English Language Learners	17/35.29%	14/42.86%	14/64.29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/22.54%	78/43.59%	82/56.10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/22.45%	56/42.86%	53/56.60%
	Students With Disabilities	22/13.64%	26/26.92%	30/16.67%
	English Language Learners	14/28.57%	17/23.53%	15/60%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63/38.46%	67/40.54%	68/50.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/27.27%	45/29.17%	45/44.44%
	Students With Disabilities	15/11.76%	16/11.11%	16/12.50%
	English Language Learners	5/20%	5/16.67%	5/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63/39.68%	67/43.28%	70/68.57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/30.95%	45/35.56%	45/66.67%
	Students With Disabilities	15/33.33%	16/31.25%	16/56.25%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/0%	5/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	269/75%	246/83%	132/80%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	177/74%	165/80%	87/79%
	Students With Disabilities	64/47%	61/60%	29/79%
	English Language Learners	18/100%	13/60%	10/80%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	269/75%	246/83%	132/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	177/74%	165/80%	87/79%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	20		35	40		43				
ELL	61			52							
BLK	46			31							
HSP	49			45							
WHT	60	45		61	65		74				
FRL	53	35	50	53	49	54	63				
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				
ELL	50	58		41	50		54				
BLK	60	41		48	39						
HSP	61	62	41	56	55	46	77				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	55
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	39
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	51
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	61
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Mathematics showed to be lower across most grade levels as evidenced in progress monitoring data for grades 1st-3rd. In addition, students with diverse needs in the primary grades decreased performance during the Winter diagnostic of iReady.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The areas of greatest need for improvement are English Language Arts learning gains decreasing from 59% to 42%, Mathematics learning gain for African Americans decreasing from 22% to 17%, and Science achievement decreasing from 56% to 43% for students with disabilities.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some contributing factors to this need for improvements were interruption of instruction due to the pandemic of Covid-19 and the lack of intervention support from the interventionist for students with disabilities.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Areas that showed the most improvement were Mathematic lowest quartile increasing from 34% to 57%, and English Language Arts lowest quartile increasing from 40% to 50%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Some contributing factors for these improvements were a lower teacher-to-student ratio servicing the lowest quartile, departmentalization in fifth grade, and effective intervention instruction for third through fifth grades.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Students will be exposed to enrichment activities on Wednesdays with outside experts in the community. Acceleration opportunities such as clubs will be offered before, during, and after school. Also, fifth-grade students with disabilities will get exposure to grade-level Science content.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional learning opportunities to strengthen teachers' instructional practice are Benchmark Advance and B.e.s.t. Standards, Teacher Clarity, and AVID.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A paraprofessional will be enlisted to support students with disabilities when attending general education Science lessons. Students with disabilities in grades third through fifth will also receive additional intervention opportunities in English Language Arts. Additional tutoring opportunities in the Fall and Spring will be offered for ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African Americans in the content area of English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A decrease in English Language Arts achievement for grades 3-5 from 65% to 58%, learning gains from 59% to 50% was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. In addition, English Language Arts, specifically in SWD's achievement declined from 33% to 25% and learning gains from 50% to 20%
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement in English Language Arts in grades 3-5 from 58% to 60%, learning gains from 50% to 55%. In the ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities, increase achievement from 25% to 30% and learning gains from 20% to 30%.
Monitoring:	Progress in this Area of Focus will be monitored through iReady Diagnostics, district assessments, classroom walkthroughs, and data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Lifvendahl (shlifven@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be engaged in standards-aligned instruction, small groups, and differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction that is systematic and differentiated has an effect size of .47.

Action Steps to Implement

ESSA Subgroup additional intervention with the interventionist
 ESSA Subgroup Targeted tutoring in the Spring and Fall
 Implementation of BEST Standards
 School Professional Learning in August will be dedicated to Benchmark Advance
 Conduct quarterly data review of progress monitoring data during PLC.
 Conduct quarterly progress meetings to review data with Interventionists, ESE, and ESOL.
 Observation of small group instruction and feedback with action plan.

Person Responsible Scott Lifvendahl (shlifven@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the Panorama Survey, Osteen Elementary students in grades 3-5 are scoring 36% in emotion regulation and 60% in social awareness.
-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Measurable Outcome:	By the last Panorama survey, students in grades 3-5 will increase the scoring on emotion regulation and social awareness by 5 points.
----------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Monitoring:	The Panorama survey will be administered three times in the school year. The times for administration are the first, third, and fourth quarters.
--------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Self-monitoring and self-efficacy are strategies that will be implemented for this area of focus.
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students that self-monitor behavior can brainstorm strategies to regulate emotions.
-----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Action Steps to Implement

Integrate Panorama Playbook and Sanford Harmony strategies in classroom instruction.
 Integrate SEL lessons from the Social Studies curriculum.
 Acceleration opportunities such as clubs before, during, and after school.
 Integrate a calm down area in classrooms with sensory items and emotion regulation posters.

Person Responsible	Kevin Percy (kwpercy@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A decrease in Mathematics, specifically in SWD's achievement from 47% to 35% and learning gains from 59% to 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

We will monitor progress using various district assessments and IReady diagnostics to increase learning gains rates from 40% to 50% and achievement from 35% to 45%.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through the completion of Lesson Gain Charts and Support Facilitation Monitoring Log. Administrators will engage in walkthroughs with actions plans, and quarterly data chats to monitor students' progress in Mathematic achievement and learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Lifvendahl (shlifven@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The strategies for this area of focus are standards-aligned instruction, deliberate practice, and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It is important that students engage in deliberate practice of standards-aligned instruction which has an effect size of .79. In addition, students' participation in small group instruction is important which has an effect size of .47.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring of Lesson Gain Chart and Support Facilitation Monitoring Logs

Person Responsible

Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will administer iReady Diagnostics, will analyze data, and create small groups for instruction.

Person Responsible

Patricia Randall (prandall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walkthroughs to ensure students are engaging in deliberate practice on standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible

Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Engage in conversations during PLC about the achievement of Mathematics Topic Checks and learning gains as seen in iReady of students with disabilities.

Offer tutoring during the Fall and Spring in Mathematics.

Person Responsible

Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the 2019-2020 SafeSchoolsForAlex.org, Osteen Elementary ranked 768 out of 1395 elementary statewide. This school falls Incidents disruption on campus was listed high and total suspension. In-school suspensions 24 and out-of-school 34. Two incidents were reported to law enforcement. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing social-emotional learning strategies from Sanford Harmony and Panorama Playbook. Mentoring for students struggling with behaviors will continue to take place. Quarterly data chats during professional learning community and action plans will be conducted to better support students struggling with behavior.

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.

Faculty and staff mentor students and follow them through grade levels. Unique opportunities are available for peer mentoring. Faculty incentivize students for academic and behavior improvements with Bronco Bucks and special events. Stakeholders collaborate to make the following events possible, Back to School BBQ, Storybook dress-up day, character dress-up day, fall festival, 50s days, Light up Osteen and Holiday Walk, Literacy Week, Red Ribbon Week, Jump Rope for Heart, Beast Run 5K, Aquapalooza, Spring Musical, Science and Math Night, Green Eggs and Ham Breakfast, and Bananas about Books.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The following stakeholders promote a positive culture and environment at Osteen: Parent-Teacher Association, Business partners Bambino, PELLs Nursery, and Osteen Dinner. The parent center offers a variety of supports from food to clothing, educational games, books, Thanksgiving and Easter baskets, and Christmas Angel Tree.