

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Hickory Tree Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# 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: 6/9/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 53%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

## Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

[www.osceolaschools.net](http://www.osceolaschools.net)

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 47%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 50%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | B       | C       | B       |

### 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.  |
|                    | 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. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Alison Doe

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

26

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Demographic Data**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 53%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |



|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |      |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |      |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

## 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               | 145         | 172 | 169 | 190 | 179 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1045  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 89          | 136 | 122 | 137 | 117 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 742   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 3           | 0   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 1   | 19  | 8   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 9   | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 9   | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |

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 | 3           | 0 | 2 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |

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     | 1           | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

### 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 |       |
| 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    |

**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  |       |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 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    |

**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  |       |

## 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   |       |
|           | (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                    | 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%                      |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 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  |
| 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%       | 0    |
| 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%        | 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    |

| 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                                    | 44  |
| 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  | 55  |
| 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   | 77  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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   | 61  |
| 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                                | 55  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## 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- 2018-2019 FSA data shows 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.**

Based on 2018-2019 data, science (56%-54%) and math (63%-61%) proficiency their was a decrease of 2% points from the prior year.

**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.**

2018-2019 data shows 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?**

Based on 2018-2019 FSA assessments, 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 was on ELA interventions with monthly data chats.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Data from the 2018-2019 school year shows attendance below 90% for 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 mathematics achievement for all students.
3. Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students.
4. Improve outcomes for students in multiple subgroups.
5. Ensure strong Social-Emotional Learning supports for all students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on 2018-2019 FSA data, overall ELA proficiency increased by 4% over the prior year. However, there is a concern with planning and implementation of tier 1 instruction. Looking at cohorts of students in the preceding three years, students decreased in proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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.
6. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to produce engaging lessons and analyze student data to make informed decisions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003) If teachers collaboratively plan deliberate standards based tier 1 instruction, with the end goal in mind, then student achievement will increase.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will meet weekly with the literacy coach to plan assessments, standards based instruction, review data, and plan for differentiation to meet individual student needs. Student data will be tracked by standard, using 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 NWEA, DIBELS, NSGRA and Osceola Writes three times a year, and district formatives twice a year.

**Person Responsible**

Kimberly Coughlin (kimberly.coughlin@osceolaschools.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on 2018-2019 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 continued to decrease in the preceding three years.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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:** Jason Wright (jason.wright@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 student 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.
6. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to produce engaging lessons and analyze student data to make informed decisions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010).

**Action Steps to Implement**

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 walk-throughs 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 diagnostic and formative assessment data, including district formative assessments and NWEA, 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.
8. Daily Math Talks will be included in daily lesson plans
9. PLCs will analyze student data to make instructional decision and plan remediation and acceleration where needed.

**Person Responsible:** Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)

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

Based on 2018-2019 data, science proficiency dropped 2% from the prior year. Student data indicates that instructional practices in place are not moving students.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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:**

Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)

**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. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to produce engaging lessons and analyze student data to make informed decisions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Reading comprehension is strongly associated with academic achievement, including science achievement. A better understanding of reading comprehension processes in science text might hold promise for improving science achievement in the long run.(Cromley & Azevedo, 2007)  
If teachers plan to deliberately incorporate reading comprehension skills into science instruction, then student achievement will increase.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will meet weekly to plan standards based instruction using the 5Es model, 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, including district provide progress monitoring.
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.
9. Teachers will implement the 5Es model as a part of their daily Science instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Based on the 2018-2019 data, overall ESSA proficiency in the 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 be closely monitored.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase the percentage of proficiency by at least 6%. Focus on the best practices in tier 1 instruction and interventions.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>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.</p> <p>Monitoring -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The leadership team will meet to discuss and analyze progress monitoring data.</li> <li>2. Weekly MTSS meetings to discuss proper placement for each students to receive targeted instruction.</li> <li>3. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation with fidelity and meetings to focus on IEP goals</li> <li>4. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.</li> <li>5. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to plan engaging and rigorous lessons that meet the needs of ELL and ESE students based on student data with research-based supports.</li> </ol> <p>If teachers plan deliberated standards based instruction tier 1 instruction, then student achievement will increase. Focus will also be given to intervention time, IEP goals, and language goals.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:</p> <p>Content- the information and skills that students need to learn</p> <p>Process -how students make sense of the content being taught</p> <p>Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned</p> <p>Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning</p>  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

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.
4. Teachers will incorporate language goals for ELL students in each unit of study.
5. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.

6..PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.

7. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups.

**Person Responsible** German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

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.
4. Teachers will incorporate language goals for ELL students in each unit of study.

**Person Responsible** German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to CASEL, decades of research show that high-quality, well-implemented SEL programs can have a positive effect on school climate, student behavior, and student achievement. Panorama data shows that in the area of emotional regulation, only 40% responded positively. This is below the district average by 2%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the percentage of favorable responses in the area of emotional regulation by at least 3%. Incorporating Panorama lessons in this area will be a top priority.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Research shows that student perceptions of teaching and learning strongly correlate with learning outcomes. By embedding interactive structures through context and non-context related activities, students will practice the SEL competencies highlighted as critical for student achievement.

Monitoring:

1. The leadership team will meet to discuss progress monitoring data along with behavior data.
2. The leadership team will conduct regular classroom walk-throughs to track implementation of collaborative structures/SEL supports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983). If teachers plan to deliberately include interactive structures into each academic content area, then student achievement will increase. Additionally, if all school personnel support students in developing self-management, self-awareness, relationship building skills, and responsible decision making risky behaviors among students will decrease.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will participate in district provided professional development to support SEL in the classroom.
2. Teachers will implement SEL competencies, including collaborative structures, in daily lesson plans as highlighted in the Curriculum Unit Plans.
3. Instructional coaches will model collaborative structures
4. Guidance Counselors will provide character lessons to all grade levels.
5. Teachers will incorporate Panorama lessons into their classroom activities.
6. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
7. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.
8. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.
9. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

**Person Responsible:** Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

**#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary education for all students-not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.

**Measurable Outcome:**

In 2019-2020 the 0% of students had access to lessons on college and career readiness.

In 2020-2021 there will be an increase of 50% school wide.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing post-secondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequenced activities that focus on personal development and career exploration.
3. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.
4. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually cutting across the exclusionary social groups.
5. Teachers will enhance study skills and meta-cognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
6. Administration and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation on topics that matter to them.

**Person Responsible**

Lauren Stedman (lauren.stedman@osceolascholls.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. Hickory Tree frequently communicates high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in dis-aggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- Implementation of the PBIS SOAR Expectations

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC

council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue.

Seeking

input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We

also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate

(schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation).

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.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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



## Part V: Budget

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

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                               | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                              | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                           | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups            | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning          | \$0.00        |
| 6             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |