Hickory Tree Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Alison Doe

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2018-19 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Osceola 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

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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Doe, Alison	Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP. Facilitate the leadership team in the StockTake process. Support the implementation of standards based instruction.
Salvato, Faith	Assistant Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP. Facilitate the leadership team in the StockTake process. Support the implementation of standards based instruction.
Coughlin, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Supports the implementation of the SIP. Oversee literacy education and provide teachers support and resources. Oversee the implementation of standards based instruction in ELA.
O'Neill, Patricia	SAC Member	Serve on the SAC committee to update stakeholders and monitor the implementation of the SIP.
Ortiz, German	Instructional Coach	Supports the implementation of the SIP. Facilitates MTSS implementation and progress monitoring for reading and math. Oversee the implementation of interventions.
Stedman, Lauren	School Counselor	Supports the implementation of the SIP. Oversee the implementation of Positive Behavior Supports and provide social emotional learning lesson in the classroom.
David, Brandi	Instructional Coach	Supports the implementation of the SIP. Oversee mathematics and science education and provide teachers support and resources. Oversee the implementation of standards based instruction in math and science.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	128	147	153	164	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	24	29	38	36	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	20	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
	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	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	9	8	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/17/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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 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	5	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									
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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	53%	57%	64%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	51%	53%	48%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	55%	63%	67%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	59%	62%	61%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	47%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	49%	53%	73%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	128 (0)	147 (0)	153 (0)	164 (0)	155 (0)	0 (0)	747 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	24 (22)	29 (14)	38 (11)	36 (13)	27 (18)	43 (16)	197 (94)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (4)	1 (6)	1 (20)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (1)	20 (1)	11 (1)	9 (5)	42 (9)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (15)	14 (30)	17 (14)	46 (59)
	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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	51%	14%	58%	7%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
05	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	54%	16%	62%	8%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	53%	9%	64%	-2%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
05	2019	51%	48%	3%	60%	-9%
	2018	57%	52%	5%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	53%	1%
	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	35	54	27	51	52	18				
ELL	46	63	55	49	51	27	35				
BLK	52	55	50	48	45	20	36				
HSP	57	65	57	55	60	38	38				
MUL	85			85	60						
WHT	65	60	53	65	65	56	65				
FRL	57	59	48	52	55	40	49				

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				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	50
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

School Data- Math learning gains in the lowest 25%. However, we gained 8% point going from a 35% to a 43%.

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

In science (56%-54%) and math (635-61%) proficiency their was a decrease of 2% points.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We performed higher than the state average in every component.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that show the most improvement was in learning gains in ELA. There was an increase in 13% points (49%-62%).
Deliberate focus on ELA interventions with monthly data chats.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance below 90% was at 94 students.

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

1. Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy
2. Ensure high levels of mathematic achievement for all students
3. Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students
4. Ensure a schoolwide post secondary culture for all students
5. Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met (with the PLC Action Plan embedded within the action steps and monitoring)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy
Rationale	Based on the last years data, overall ELA proficiency has increased by 4%. However, there is a concern with planning and implementation of tier 1 instruction. Looking at cohorts of students over the last three years, students have decreased in proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on the best practices in tier 1 instruction is a top priority.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states tier 1 instruction is considered the key component of tiered instruction, all students receive instruction within an evidence-based, scientifically researched core program. A tier 1 instructional program is synonymous with the core reading curriculum that is aligned with state standards. Monitoring - 1. The leadership team will meet to discuss and analyze progress monitoring data. 2. Weekly MTSS meetings to discuss proper placement for each students to receive targeted instruction. 3. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation with fidelity. 4. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 5. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers plan deliberated standards based instruction tier 1 instruction, then student achievement will increase.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will meet weekly with the literacy coach to plan standards based instruction, review data, and plan for differentiation to meet individual student needs. Student data will be tracked by standard, suing both summative and common formative assessments. 2. Professional Development will be provided on standards based instruction and differentiation. PD will be held throughout the year to build shared knowledge of highly effective ELA instruction. 3. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback. 4. The literacy coach will model effective literacy strategies in the classroom. 5. Use and monitor formative assessment, such as DIBELS and NSGRA three times a years, and Osceola Writes three times a year, and district formatives quarterly 6. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson. 7. Writing will be incorporated in every lesson.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)

#2	
Title	Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students
Rationale	Based on last years FSA data, math proficiency dropped by 2%. There is a concern in tier 1 instruction, standards based planning , and student tasks. Looking at cohorts of students, proficiency in math has continued to decrease over the past three years.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of learning gains, lowest quartile, and proficiency by at least 3% in each area. Focus on math interventions will be a top priority.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brandi David (brandi.david@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states tier 1 instruction is considered the key component of tiered instruction, all students receive instruction within an evidence-based, scientifically researched core program. A tier 1 instructional program is synonymous with the core mathematics curriculum that is aligned with state standards. Monitoring - 1. The leadership team will meet to discuss and analyze progress monitoring data. 2. Weekly MTSS meetings to discuss proper placement for each students to receive targeted instruction. 3. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation with fidelity. 4. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 5. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers plan deliberate standards based instruction tier 1 instruction, then student achievement will increase.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will meet weekly with the math coach to plan standards based instruction, review data, and plan for differentiation to meet individual student needs. 2. Professional Development will be provided on standards based instruction and differentiation all year long. PD will be developed based on Learning Cycle data and CWT data. 3. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback. 4. The math coach will model effective mathematics strategies in the classroom. 5. Use and monitor formative assessment in all tiers of instruction (one, two, and three) 6. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson. 7. Writing will be incorporated in every lesson.
Person Responsible	Brandi David (brandi.david@osceolaschools.net)

#3	
Title	Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students
Rationale	Based on last years data, science proficiency dropped 2%. Current student data shows that prcatices in place are not moving students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of students proficient in science by 3%. Focus on hands on learning and collaboration with ELA is a priority.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states, the same knowledge and skills that drive higher reading comprehension also drive higher science comprehension. Students need to develop scientific literacy in order to increase proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers plan to deliberately incorporate reading comprehension skills into science instruction, then student achievement will increase.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will meet weekly to plan standards based instruction, review data, and plan for differentiation to meet individual student needs. 2. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback. 3. The math/science and literacy coach will model effective science/literacy strategies in the classroom. 5. Use and monitor formative assessments. 6. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson. 7. Teachers will track student progress by standards and interventions will be provided if needed. Students will also track their progress of standards through data chats with their teachers. 8. PD will be provided to teachers by the Math/Science Coach based on data from Learning Cycle visits and daily CWT.
Person Responsible	Brandi David (brandi.david@osceolaschools.net)

#4	
Title	Ensure a schoolwide post secondary culture for all students
Rationale	There is a need to bring more awareness to post secondary education at the elementary level. Students need to be educated on post secondary opportunities and be provided a foundation of college and career readiness.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2018-2019 school year, only 5th grade students participated in lessons and activities on college and career readiness. For the 2019-2020 school year, all students will participate in college and career readiness activities. This will be measured by the number of students participating in these activities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states, introducing students to college and career at an early age, helps students see post secondary options as a realistic goal. This can be built upon throughout their academic career.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By bringing an awareness to post secondary options, students will understand that post secondary education and lifelong learning are necessary for career success.
Action Step	
Description	1. Sharing information and building awareness 2. Engaging parents, students and the community 3. 1 day a month- college and career focus day 3. Assemblies on college and career readiness.
Person Responsible	Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

#5	
Title	Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met (with the PLC Action Plan embedded within the action steps and monitoring).
Rationale	The data shows that PLCs are not operating consistently at a high level on the Seven Stages Rubric and formative assessment data throughout the year. This impacts student achievement as there are inconsistencies within delivering the curriculum in each subject area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All PLCs will be at stage 5 or above on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric assessed by the Principal by May 2020 using the Seven Stage Rubric and formative data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Monitoring - 1. Administration, PLC Lead, and PLC Guided Coalition will meet to discuss 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 Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams by the Principal. With the addition of formative assessment scores for Math, ELA, and Science PLCs. 3. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 4. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction, then student achievement will increase.
Action Step	
Description	1. Schools PLC's 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 progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team. 2. Principal and assistant principal (s) will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure they are progressing through the PLC Seven Stages Rubric of an effective PLC. 3.Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes. 4. School City 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. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform.

5. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team.

6. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process.

7. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability areas.

8. Principals will present within their schoolwide PLC a State of Education on a quarterly period to their staff (August 2019, November 2019, January 2020, and March 2020).

Person Responsible Faith Salvato (faith.salvato@osceolaschools.net)

#6	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for ESE and ELL students
Rationale	Based on the last years data, overall ESSA proficiency in ESE subgroup is still below the state requirement of 41%. HTE earned a score of 37%, an increase from the previous year. OUr ELL subgroup surpassed the state requirement but will continue to closely monitor.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of proficiency by at least 6%. Focus on the best practices in tier 1 instruction and interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alison Doe (alison.doe@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states tier 1 instruction is considered the key component of tiered instruction, all students receive instruction within an evidence-based, scientifically researched core program. A tier 1 instructional program is synonymous with the core reading curriculum that is aligned with state standards. Monitoring - 1. The leadership team will meet to discuss and analyze progress monitoring data. 2. Weekly MTSS meetings to discuss proper placement for each students to receive targeted instruction. 3. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation with fidelity and meetings to focus on IEP goals 4. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 5. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers plan deliberated standards based instruction tier 1 instruction, then student achievement will increase. Focus will also be given to intervention time and IEP goals.

Action Step	
Description	1. SWD and ELL students will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher and ESOL para when applicable. 2. SWD and ELL students will receive intervention based on their tier 3, tier 2, and tier 1 individual needs 3. Teachers will deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction. Monitoring will take place by RCS and ECS. .
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of programs at Hickory Tree. All parents are invited to attend meetings through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and training provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide next steps.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Hickory Tree Elementary has 2 counselors and a shared social worker position to support the socio-emotional needs of students. Second Step intervention kits are used to support social-emotional learning environments.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Hickory Tree Elementary has a half day pre-kindergarten program. Pre-K provides a balanced instructional approach to learning skills necessary for kindergarten. Throughout the year, there are vertical articulation meetings with grade levels.

As a school, we discuss being college and career ready. Each classroom has a Class of sign that represents their high school graduation year. We also provide college and career information on the morning announcements.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS process at Hickory Tree Elementary is designed to identify students academic and behavioral needs and to provide resources to differentiate for all students. Through the use of baseline data, students are provided tier 1 and supplemental intervention if needed. The Problem Solving Committee meets weekly to discuss student placement and progress monitoring data. Additionally, data chats are held monthly with all staff that provide interventions and decisions are made to best meet student needs.

Title I, Part D

When Neglected and/or Delinquent children enroll, we will coordinate efforts with the Alternative Programs Department to ensure that all student needs are met.

Title II

Focused professional learning opportunities are offered in: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Instructional Pipeline and Framework Design, Standards Based Instruction, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Title III

The Multicultural Department assists in the identification of at-risk Limited English Proficiency (LEP), immigrant, and Native American students. Research-based, comprehensive educational programs help reduce barriers that result from cultural and linguistic needs.

IDEA provides support for students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP), students identified through the Preschool Education Evaluation Program (PEEP), and students identified through gifted screening of all second grade Title I students.

Title IV

The Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) program is intended to help to:

1. Provide a well-rounded education,

2. Improve safe and healthy school conditions and

3. Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. (ESEA section 4101).

Title IX

To help eliminate education barriers the District Liaison works with the school to help homeless students to enroll, attend, and succeed in our public schools. For students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act, the Liaison provides health/academic referrals and resource vouchers.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

At Hickory Tree Elementary, information is shared to build student awareness of post secondary options. Once a month, there is a college and career focused day in which all students participate. Activities and assemblies focus on students gaining knowledge of what post secondary options are available to them.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy			$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			Budget Focus			2019-20
			0501 - Hickory Tree Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Requested from SAC $4,500 to renew MyOwn reading program for all students vpk -5th grade. MyOwn is a reading comprehension tool that can be used both at school and at home to support our ELA goals.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Ensure a schoolwide post secondary culture for all students**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met (with the PLC Action Plan embedded within the action steps and monitoring).**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0501 - Hickory Tree Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Requested $6,000 from SAC to request for substitutes to allows teachers to collaborate on tier 1 and tier 2 instruction in order to reach our goals in both reading and math.			
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for ESE and ELL students**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$0.00**