

Orange County Public Schools

Hidden Oaks Elementary



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hidden Oaks Elementary

9051 SUBURBAN DR, Orlando, FL 32829

<https://hiddenoaks.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	A	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Holmes, Kenisha	Principal
Fulbright, Kathleen	Instructional Coach
Oyler, Sally	School Counselor
Peck, Shelby	Instructional Coach
Peedin, Tawny	Instructional Coach
Hurtado-Perez, Yolanda	Instructional Coach
Elfreth, Laura	Instructional Media
King, Reginald	Dean
Pares, Christine	Instructional Coach

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Weekly leadership team meetings are scheduled to communicate successes and challenges throughout the school and to share in problem solving issues as they may arise.

The Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher and Instructional Coaches conduct informal and formal observations and evaluations of instructional staff. The CRT serves as the testing coordinator for local and state assessments and serves as the data coach. The Behavior Specialist assists teachers who teach students with severe behavioral concerns and provides strategies. The Compliance Teacher maintains data on the LEP population as well as strategies for ensuring the academic success of these identified students. The Compliance Teacher also serves as the MTSS coach. The Staffing Specialist monitors errors and compliance with all ESE plans and testing. The Guidance Counselor serves as the homeless coordinator in addition to meeting with teachers and students to provide strategies for dealing with difficult situations. The Instructional Coaches provide assistance to teachers in the areas of Math, Science, and Writing through modeling lessons, co-planning lessons, and analyzing data to make instructional decisions.

Each member of the Leadership Team serves as a resource for students and teachers. Each member serves on a grade level Professional Learning Community (PLC) to provide coaching and facilitation

of lesson planning based on grade level, and individual student data and needs exhibited based on assessment data, such as, Formative and Summative assessments , FLKRS and IREADY data which describe the students gap or deficiency. Members of the Leadership Team provide weekly feedback to teachers in the areas of lesson plans, delivery of lessons, and provide coaching and best practice teaching strategies as needed.

MTSS members monitor student progress through weekly PLC meetings that are driven by student data. Ongoing professional development and expectations of the MTSS process are cultivated during the weekly meetings.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	20	15	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	2	0	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	28	15	23	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	1	9	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Year 2016-17 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	28	15	23	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	1	9	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest 25% of students in reading and math performed the lowest. This is a trend across the district as students in this subgroup performed significantly lowered compared to same age peers. However, it is not a school trend, as evidenced by the 2017-2018 data. Students in the lowest 25% in ELA had 70% learning gains and 55% in Math.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year are those students in the lowest 25% in Reading and Math. On the 2017 ELA Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), students in the lowest 25% made 70% learning gains , compared to 40% in 2018. On the 2017 Math FSA , students in the lowest 25% made 55% learning gains, compared to 31% in 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component with the biggest gap is the percent of Math students who scored at a level 3 or above. The state average is 62%, Hidden Oaks is 59 %.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

none

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

none

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	56%	56%	58%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	55%	50%	52%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	48%	45%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	61%	63%	62%	55%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	57%	59%	65%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	46%	47%	41%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	61%	55%	55%	36%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (14)	17 (28)	20 (15)	15 (23)	14 (11)	13 (11)	90 (102)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	2 (2)	4 (3)	5 (1)	12 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5)	1 (6)	2 (5)	8 (16)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (15)	19 (13)	22 (25)	58 (53)

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	2018	56%	55%	1%	57%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2017	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2018	56%	55%	1%	55%	1%
	2017	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2017	77%	63%	14%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
	2017	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
	2017	56%	56%	0%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	34	30	40	24	32		36				
ELL	41	39		47	29						
ASN	80			80							

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
BLK	59	60		53	60						
HSP	56	53	47	60	48	33	67				
WHT	68	63		57	43		45				
FRL	59	54	40	59	49	32	61				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	62	60	35	57		27				
ELL	44	64		44	64	50					
BLK	48	65		39	47		55				
HSP	62	65	68	69	72	63	55				
WHT	69	58		72	69		72				
FRL	61	63	62	66	68	50	49				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Learning Gains for our lowest 25% in Reading and Math.
Rationale	Learning gains for the lowest 25% in both Reading and Math dropped significantly from the prior school year. This subgroup of students are not progressing at the expected rate.
Intended Outcome	All students in our lowest 25% subgroup will make at least one year's learning gain as evidenced by the IREADY end of year diagnostic and performance on the 2018-2019 Florida State Standards Assessment.
Point Person	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	Intervention teacher will disaggregate prior year IREADY and FSA data and develop a plan to support the lowest 25% in both Reading and Math (3-5). Intervention teacher will monitor lesson progress in IREADY for the lowest 25% in both Reading and Math on a weekly basis and intervene when students are not passing lessons.
Person Responsible	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional Leadership Team will meet on a weekly basis to discuss progress of the lowest 25% and make adjustments as necessary. In addition, during bi-weekly MTSS meetings, teachers and instructional coaches will disaggregate common assessment data and develop a plan of action to support students who are not progressing at the expected rate.
Person Responsible	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)
Activity #2	
Title	CLOSE READING
Rationale	Teachers need support with understanding how to incorporate the close reading process within their instruction when lesson planning.
Intended Outcome	Teachers will develop lesson plans which include the close reading process. Teachers will understand the difference between text dependent and standard based questions.
Point Person	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	DPLC team will provide on-going professional development on the close-reading process. The team will specifically focus on annotations and differentiating between text dependent and standards based questions.
Person Responsible	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Effectiveness will be monitored through lesson plan checks, professional development exit slips and informal and formal observations.
Person Responsible	Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)

Activity #3	
Title	Culturally Responsive School
Rationale	Teachers don't understand the connection between Culturally Responsive Practices and Student Achievement.
Intended Outcome	Narrow achievement and increase collaboration between the school and the Minority Achievement Office.
Point Person	Tawny Peedin (tawny.peedin@ocps.net)
Action Step	
	Provide resources and materials to support student acquisition of non-native language
Description	a. Purchase NEWSELA vocabulary acquisition program
	b. Bi-weekly progress monitoring meeting with ELL Resource and classroom teacher to discuss student progression
Person Responsible	Tawny Peedin (tawny.peedin@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly progress monitoring meetings with the Minority Achievement Office with quarterly reviews.
Person Responsible	Tawny Peedin (tawny.peedin@ocps.net)