Hickory Tree Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.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	66%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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 achieve high levels of learning for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To outperform all elementary schools in the district.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Doe, Alison	Principal
Salvato, Faith	Assistant Principal
Coughlin, Kimberly	Instructional Coach
Reid, Stephen	SAC Member
Miner, Jami	Teacher, K-12
Stake, Jessica	School Counselor
Ortiz, German	Instructional Coach
Stedman, Lauren	School Counselor

Duties

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

*The leadership team will lead the MTSS team in collection, interpretation and analysis of data, interventions, facilitates development of intervention plan, provides support and resources to staff and ensures fidelity of interventions and collection of data.
*Instructional Coaches will assist staff in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, provide resources, help plan lessons, and help monitor fidelity. Coaches will support the implementation of Tier 1,2,3 students and assist in progress monitoring assessments and provide professional development in specific areas.
*Administration will support the team in the analysis of data and provide professional development for teachers. Administration will assist in communicating with parents and outside resources to help our students.
*School Counselors and Psychologist will participate in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitate development of intervention plans and provide support for by communicating with parents and others outside of school.

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	22	14	11	13	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	30	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	5	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	4	11	19	13	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

Date this data was collected
Monday 7/16/2018

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	16	16	15	16	13	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	5	2	6	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	20	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	0	2	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	16	16	15	16	13	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	5	2	6	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	20	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	0	2	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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 data in all areas declined from the pervious year. The school has been on a decline in student achievement for the past two years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The area that showed the greatest decline was in Science, from 73% to 56%. The next component that had a large decline was in Math Lowest 25% from 47% to 35%.

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

The area that has the biggest gap when compared to the state average is Math Lowest 25%.

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

This past year Hickory Tree did not show growth in any areas. Our goal this year is to change this trend with deliberate focus on standards based planning and instruction, use of data to guide small group instruction and interventions, and collaborative planning with academic coaches.

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	58%	51%	56%	68%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	55%	63%	55%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	48%	53%	50%	46%
Math Achievement	63%	54%	62%	70%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	54%	56%	59%	62%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	42%	47%	47%	49%	46%
Science Achievement	56%	51%	55%	80%	54%	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	22 (16)	14 (16)	11 (15)	13 (16)	18 (13)	16 (27)	94 (103)
One or more suspensions	0 (5)	3 (2)	3 (6)	4 (1)	4 (5)	6 (7)	20 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (10)	30 (20)	14 (37)	59 (67)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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	2018	66%	51%	15%	57%	9%
	2017	66%	53%	13%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
	2017	62%	50%	12%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2018	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%
	2017	55%	48%	7%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	69%	51%	18%	62%	7%
	2017	63%	56%	7%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	60%	53%	7%	62%	-2%
	2017	59%	55%	4%	64%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2018	57%	52%	5%	61%	-4%
	2017	66%	49%	17%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
	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	24	44	57	24	18	19	33				
ELL	36	43	33	45	36	8					
BLK	40	31		44	38						
HSP	47	46	41	58	52	29	41				
MUL	81			65							
WHT	65	52	50	67	58	41	63				
FRL	50	45	53	62	56	35	50				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	42	43	26	33	24	26				
ELL	41	37	31	49	52	38	25				
BLK	60			60							
HSP	48	51	48	58	67	54	60				
MUL	83			75							
WHT	71	53	45	70	57	40	82				
FRL	61	58	52	61	58	38	73				

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	PLCs
Rationale	Collaborative planning is necessary to increase student growth. A focus on creating a complete viable curriculum that uses common assessments will enable our teachers to monitor student progress towards achieving our school wide goals.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to raise student achievement on assessments and mastery of Florida standards through daily instruction/tasks. Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on guided reading and student engagement is top priority.
Point Person	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	1. School PLC teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on course profession of individual student's needs as a collaborative team. 2.Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes. 3. GradeCam will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. 4. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team. 5. A PLC guiding coalition will be formed to oversee the process. 6. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability.
Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Administration, PLC lead facilitator, and PLC guide coalition will monitor all accountability area collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2.PLC seven stage rubric will be used to measure pre/mid/end of school year progress of the PLC teams. 3.School stocktake model will take place monthly to report progress to the principal on the area of focus. 4.Principals will update assistant superintendent of curriculum during the monthly check-ins. 5.Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and assistant superintendents once a quarter on progress of the area of focus through the school stocktake model.
Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Standards Based Instruction and Planning
Rationale	Based on student data, current practices are not effectively moving students towards grade level standards mastery.
Intended Outcome	While working in PLC's and during collaborative planning, teacher teams will identify essential standards and develop a proficiency scale with an instructional pathway. Learning will be monitored and adapted through the use of formative and common assessments. Proficiency ELA increase from 58% to 61% Learning Gains ELA increase from 49% to 52% Lowest 25% increase from 44% to 47% Proficiency Math increase from 63% to 66% Learning Gains Math increase from 54% to 57% Lowest 25% increase from 35% to 38% Proficiency Science increase from 53% to 58%
Point Person	German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Create standards based lessons, rigorous tasks, and assessment using learning goals from their proficiency scales created during collaborative planning sessions, followed up with feedback and peer observations. In house PD may be provided if needed. Thinkin Tuesdays, which occurs every week with academic coaches, ensure that collaborative planning ,student tasks are aligned with Florida Standards and use of proficiency scales will support teachers in seeing that students are mastering the standards and applying them to all assigned tasks. Provide substitutes for classroom teachers to provide planning with scales and do lesson study peer observation and planning to increase student discourse, student engagement, and student accountability using scales and teachers monitoring student learning. PD to practice with district support and academic coaches.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	CWT by leadership team data from assessments, including Grade Cam and Iready Diagnostic and Standards Mastery Lesson Plans Agendas from PLC and ThinkingTuesdays Stocktake meetings MTSS meetings and data chats
Person Responsible	German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

Activity #3	
Title	MTSS System and Interventions
Rationale	As a PST streamline the MTSS process with clear roles and expectations to be consistent school wide. Additionally, identify and provide resources and training to staff on how to use the resources with fidelity. Meet monthly to monitor the effectiveness of interventions.
Intended Outcome	Maximize use of intervention time using appropriate resources to meet the needs of all students and monitor student growth through MTSS data chats. Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on guided reading and student engagement in math is top priority.
Point Person	Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)
Action Step	
Description	Student trackers and data chats stay current monitor of IReady CWT during intervention time Staff members will be bring current data on targeted students to monthly data chats to discuss student progress. Data chats occur once a month per grade level and will be from September until May. Growth monitoring and progress monitoring will also occur, as well as using data from Grade Cam and both formative and summative assessments.
Person Responsible	Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	CWT feedback PLC minutes Stocktake minutes student data lesson plans data chats minutes
Person Responsible	Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

Activity #4	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy
Rationale	Based on last two years FSA data, ELA proficiency dropped 5%. There is a concern in tier 1 instruction, planning and student tasks. Both learning gains dropped 6% and lowest quartile dropped 9% as well and was the major reason why the school grade dropped from a B to a C.
Intended Outcome	Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on guided reading and text in hand is top priority.
Point Person	Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	.Teachers will meet weekly with literacy coach to plan lessons, review data, look at student evidence and adapt to meet the needs of our students. PD will be provided on resources to support student during iii, such as Corrective Reading ,LLI, Jacobs Ladder, Comprehension Tool Kit, model lessons, and do CWT while offering support to both new and veteran teachers. The leadership team will determine areas of need through observations and data. Data is driven based off of data collected through CWT, Stocktake Meetings, Learning Cycles, and MTSS data chats. An ELL and ESE task force will be implemented to monitor the learning and gains throughout the school year. The task force will monitor student data and track trends. Communication will take place with ECS, RCS, and VE teachers. District formative assessments will be given every four weeks in all accountability areas.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Leadership Team, PLC leads and grade levels will monitor ELA in al of the following areas: iReady, ELA formatives and summatives. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to the principal on the area of focus. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Asst. Superintendents once a quarter on progress the Area of Focus through the school Stocktake Model. Data will be shared during PLCs and used to develop next action steps.
Person Responsible	Faith Salvato (faith.salvato@osceolaschools.net)

Activity #5	
Title	Ensure high levels of mathematives achievement for all students
Rationale	Based on last two years FSA data, Math proficiency dropped 6%. There is a concern in tier 1 instruction, planning and student tasks. Both learning gains dropped 4% and lowest quartile data dropped 14%and was the major reason why the school grade dropped from a B to a C.
Intended Outcome	Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on small group instruction, student engagement are a must.
Point Person	German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Teachers will meet weekly with math coach to plan lessons, review data, look at student evidence and adapt to meet the needs of our students. PD in student engagement ,Tenmarks, Grade cam, Plickers model lessons, and do CWT while offering support to both new and veteran teachers. The leadership team will determine areas of need through observations and data. Data is driven based off of data collected through CWT, Stocktake Meetings, Learning Cycles, and MTSS data chats. An ELL and ESE task force will be implemented to monitor the learning and gains throughout the school year. The task force will monitor student data and track trends. Communication will take place with ECS, RCS, and VE teachers. District formative assessments will be given every four weeks in all accountability areas
Person Responsible	German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Leadership Team, PLC leads and grade levels will monitor Math in al of the following areas: iReady,Tenmarks Math formatives and summatives. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to the principal on the area of focus.Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Asst. Superintendents once a quarter on progress the Area of Focus through the school Stocktake Model. Data will be shared during PLCs and used to develop next action steps.
Person Responsible	German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)