

Volusia County Schools

Osteen Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
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: 8/4/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2020-21: (56%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
West, Heather	Instructional Coach	Mrs. West is our Reading Intervention teacher who works with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to master the standards that they need to meet.
Van Slyke, Shannon	Assistant Principal	Coordinator of SIP development
Potts, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher
Vazquez, Evette	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher
Brown, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher, grade chair
Lifvendahl, Scott	Principal	Principal and leader of school
Davis, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher, grade chair
Schneider, Naomi	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher
Hills, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/4/2021, Scott Lifvendahl

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

461

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	70	73	75	78	68	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	9	4	9	10	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 8/23/2022

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	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	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	0

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%			58%			65%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%			42%			59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%			50%			40%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	53%			57%			59%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%			57%			50%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%			57%			34%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	74%			68%			77%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%

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

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	38	38	25	44	35	41				
ELL	60	50		49	77		70				
BLK	46			38							
HSP	56	47	50	47	65	50	72				
WHT	58	60	42	58	59	40	77				
FRL	54	53	48	52	58	36	76				
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				
WHT	70	61	43	63	51	35	81				
FRL	61	56	42	56	47	32	69				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	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	56
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The ELA scores in third grade have trended downward for the past three years from 75% to 53% to 50%. In fourth grade we saw just the opposite with an upward trend in ELA scores from 53%, 54%, to 57% currently. In 5th grade it trended downward from 63% to 59% to 55%. In Math we saw a trend from 76% to currently 51% in third grade and upward in 4th from 50%-60% currently in Math. There was also a drop in Math in 5th grade to a low of 45%. Science scored higher this year at 74%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement seems to fall in both Math and ELA in third grade being 50% and 51% and 5th grade Math at 45%. Our students can do much better in both areas. We did have gains but our SWD students only met proficient level 35% of the time.

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

We need to target our SWD to make sure that at least 41% meet proficient levels and increase the achievement levels in 3rd and 5th grades to 60% in both ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our Science Scores went up from 68% of our students meeting a level 3 or better to 74% of our students. With a 6% gain and being in the top 7 in the district our students did extremely well in Science.

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

Teacher used the Target 10 standards approach to implement intervention and continued it throughout the year. This approach provided the intervention necessary to fill the gaps that the students had from previous years and mastery with the standards necessary to meet the FSA level 3 mastery of the test.

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

We are using the Target Ten Standards approach to intervention in ELA and Math for this entire school year for all grade levels. Each grade level will desegregate their data from FSA previous year, IReady, and Cambium. They will identify the 10 highest deficits and use those standards or benchmarks to focus on for the intervention time during the day in Reading first and then in January will switch focus to Math. By using a more targeted approach we feel our teachers will be using more precise standard based teaching to mastery which will increase the level of proficiency for our students.

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.

The Professional Developments will be based on the grade levels determining their 10 standards in ELA, an intervention plan, revising, data analysis, assessments. Then determining their 10 standards in Math, an intervention plan, revising, data analysis, assessments, etc.

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

PLC's will be continually used to reinforce the data and continually reassessing the progress. ESE SF teachers, Intervention teachers, ESOL teachers, and grade level will all work together to collaborate for all students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase the ELA Achievement score from an overall 54% to an overall 60% with emphasis on our SWD population. Our SWD students overall ESSA was a 35%, with only 22% SWD students being proficient in ELA. The overall ESSA score of 35% does not meet the 41% federal requirement for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the ELA overall achievement score from an overall 54% to an overall 60%. Increase the overall ESSA score for the subgroup of SWD to at least 41%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The proficiency rates and standards will be monitored throughout the year using the data from the ongoing progress monitoring of IReady data and the Cambian test given 3 times a year. Teachers will also use formative and summative assessments throughout the year in order to intervene when necessary remediation or enrichment needs to occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Osteen will identify the 10 power standards in each grade level and focus on them during Bronco time(intervention) in small group. The data will be closely monitored to see if the standards are being met and if new standards need to be added. This will allow a targeted approach for all teachers and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Osteen will use Benchmark materials during intervention time to remediate standards that have not been met by students. Standards based materials will be used to target the outcomes and readdress the standard in several different ways in order to provide students a varied approach to learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Each grade level will determine their 10 power standards and focus and devise an intervention plan for the grade levels. They will determine groups and standards based instruction that will occur and monitor the progress of the students.

Person Responsible

Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Professional Learning Communities- Review and disaggregate the data from formative assessments, summative assessments, and OPM to determine how to meet the needs of the students in Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Plan for movement in and out of groups and collaboration for changing instruction.

Person Responsible

Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Small Group Instruction-Teachers will provide small group instruction that is differentiated for all students. After determining the needs of the students, teaching with a targeted emphasis on grade level instruction as well as intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hills (smhills@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase the overall Math Achievement score from 53% to 60% with an emphasis on our SWD students to increase overall achievement to 41%.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Increase our SWD from an overall Math of only 25% and an overall ESSA score of 35%. The ESSA score falls short of the required federal guideline of 41% needed for proficiency. Osteen would also like to increase overall Math Achievement from 53% to 60%.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The proficiency rates and benchmarkss will be monitored throughout the year using the data from the ongoing progress monitoring of IReady data and the Cambium test given 3 times a year. Teachers will also use formative and summative assessments throughout the year in order to intervene when necessary remediation or enrichment needs to occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Osteen will identify the 10 power standards in each grade level and focus on them during Bronco time(intervention) in small group. The evidence used will come from the IReady testing, Fast testing, and Formative Benchmark Assessments. The data will be closely monitored to see if the standards are being met and if new benchmarkss need to be added. This will allow a targeted approach for all teachers and students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Osteen will use Benchmark materials during intervention time to remediate benchmarks that have not been met by students. Benchmark based materials will be used to target the outcomes and readdress the benchmark in several different ways in order to provide students a varied approach to learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Each grade level will determine their 10 power benchmarks and focus and devise an intervention plan for the grade levels. They will determine groups and benchmarks based instruction that will occur and monitor the progress of the students.

Person Responsible Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Professional Learning Communities- Review and disaggregate the data from formative assessments, summative assessments, and OPM to determine how to meet the needs of the students in Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Plan for movement in and out of groups and collaboration for changing instruction.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hills (smhills@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Small Group Instruction-Teachers will provide small group instruction that is differentiated for all students. After determining the needs of the students, teaching with a targeted emphasis on grade level instruction as well as intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hills (smhills@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District Math curriculum leaders work with teachers during PLCs to continue to determine benchmark concerns and strategies to implement during intervention time.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hills (smhills@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to improve practices to positively affect student outcomes.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase the positive referrals and incentives and decrease discipline referrals and punitive issues.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Osteen had 456 referrals last year. 143 were hit/strike, 86 were disruption level 2, 48 were insubordination, and 85 were small disruption or rule violations. 321 referrals occurred in the 1st and last 9 weeks. 12 students had over 10. 1 student had 32 but most was for elopement. Osteen would like to decrease the referral rate to below 300 for the next school year and reduce the rate of hitting to below 100.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Osteen has developed a program in which all students will be taught the expected behavior for all common areas of the school. All adults will reinforce behaviors by providing students with horseshoe bucks to reinforce when a student is exemplifying the correct behavior. When the classroom collects meets certain goals the class will receive a reward for their efforts. As the program is implemented the Admin team and Guidance Counselor will determine with discipline data and observations if overall modifications need to be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Positive Behavior Initiative System- Students understand the expectations in all common areas and are rewarded positively for good behavior to reinforce the expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

To increase positive behaviors and decrease negative behaviors with a schoolwide approach. We have created posters for all common areas. Teachers have Bronco posters in their classroom's describing their expectations. Students will be rewarded with horseshoes that will go on their horseshoe chart in the classroom in which they will earn classroom awards.

used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Bronco Posters for all common areas using BRONCOS acronym explaining behavioral expectations for each area.

Person Responsible Heather West (hcwest@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Positive Referrals- Positive referrals that can be sent to the office for the students can be recognized and principal can call home to give a positive message to parents.

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

3. Horseshoe Bucks- Incentive program in which students earn for their class for positive behavior to earn classroom rewards.

Person Responsible Naomi Schneider (nlschnei@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers attended PBIS training over the summer as a team. Elected leader and began to implement program this year at school base. Team trained teachers in Pre-planning and will conducted various trainings throughout the year.

Person Responsible Heather West (hcwest@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Osteen Elementary is a school that was established in 1889. It was primarily an extremely rural area made up of farming families. It has continued as a generational family school with a long commitment of the community in the success of the students and the center of the community. For many years, the Elementary school has been the event center of the town in which everyone would gather to celebrate holidays, cook outs, centennials, spring, and school events. The school has been a place for students to attend and later teach. The surrounding community is as much a part of the school as the interior hallways are. Many members of the faculty and staff are members of the community. Faculty, staff, parents, and students all feel a special part of Osteen Elementary.

Osteen Elementary's School Leadership Team started a new PBIS program this year called the

"BRONCO"program.
"B"e positive.
"R"espect yourself and others.
"O"rganize your day.
"N"ever give up.
"C"reate a caring community.
"O"wn your actions.
"S"afety first.

All stakeholders are giving students horseshoes when they see students displaying appropriate behaviors in common areas. All common area expectations have been defined. Students understand expectations and are rewarded for good behavior. Students are working together to earn class rewards. This increases the positive interactions occurring on our campus on a daily basis.

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

All stakeholders are a part of the PBIS program. The School Leadership Team worked over the summer to define the expectations for all common areas. There are expectation posters for the cafeteria, the hallways, parent pickup, the bus loop, the playground, and the classroom. The faculty, staff, administration, bus drivers, cafeteria staff, and custodial staff all have horseshoes to help reinforce good behavior. With a team like approach, the students understand that all the adults on the campus have the same expectations and will help to encourage them to make the right decision in a positive way. As classes begin to reach goal other classes will see the other students get rewarded and this will reinforce the positive behaviors they are demonstrating. Everyone plays a role in our positive culture at our school. We want our students to understand that everyone is working together to make sure that all of our students have every opportunity to learn.