

School District of Osceola County, FL

Hickory Tree Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

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: 8/16/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 53% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

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) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 41% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 53% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | B | B | C |

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 | Position 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. |
| O'Neill, Patricia | SAC Member | Serve on the SAC committee to update stakeholders and monitor the implementation of the SIP. |
| Wright, Jason | 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. |
| Cruz Santiago, Duannieh | Instructional Coach | Supports the implementation of the SIP. Facilitates MTSS implementation and progress monitoring for reading and math. Oversee the implementation of interventions. |
| Durinick, Candace | 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. |
| Stake, Jessica | School Counselor | Supports the implementation of the SIP. Oversee the implementation of Positive Behavior Supports and provide social emotional learning lesson in the classroom. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/16/2021, 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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

603

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

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

6

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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 | 84 | 90 | 105 | 111 | 91 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 594 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 20 | 17 | 23 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

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 | 6 | 4 | 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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 62% | 53% | 57% | 58% | 51% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 56% | 58% | 49% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 51% | 53% | 44% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 61% | 55% | 63% | 63% | 54% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 59% | 62% | 54% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 45% | 51% | 35% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 49% | 53% | 56% | 51% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 51% | 10% | 58% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 51% | 14% | 58% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 56% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 62% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 64% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 48% | 3% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 45% | 9% | 53% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool being using is the NWEA MAP Growth Assessment in grades 1-5.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43 54% | 41 46% | 43 49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15 47% | 14 34% | 15 37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 43% | 5 33% | 3 20% |
| | English Language Learners | 3 33% | 2 14% | 2 14% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 47 58% | 37 41% | 38 43% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 48% | 13 32% | 12 29% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4 29% | 2 13% | 5 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 4 40% | 3 21% | 1 7% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 51 57% | 46 49% | 48 51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 63% | 25 49% | 25 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 33% | 1 10% | 2 20% |
| | English Language Learners | 5 36% | 5 33% | 6 35% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 52 58% | 31 33% | 54 57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 60% | 16 31% | 28 53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 22% | 0 0% | 1 10% |
| | English Language Learners | 7 50% | 1 7% | 6 35% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 53 71% | 59 77% | 62 77% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20 57% | 27 68% | 26 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 40% | 3 43% | 2 29% |
| | English Language Learners | 7 70% | 8 73% | 9 75% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 48 64% | 49 64% | 60 74% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18 51% | 20 50% | 26 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 60% | 1 14% | 1 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 5 50% | 5 45% | 9 75% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 56 62% | 54 61% | 48 53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 55% | 23 56% | 19 46% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 25% | 3 27% | 1 9% |
| | English Language Learners | 9 47% | 9 45% | 5 25% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51 56% | 46 52% | 53 59% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23 58% | 17 41% | 23 56% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 25% | 1 9% | 1 9% |
| | English Language Learners | 7 37% | 5 25% | 7 35% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 74 69% | 72 65% | 80 69% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 61% | 28 55% | 32 62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 39% | 5 28% | 8 42% |
| | English Language Learners | 8 53% | 9 60% | 13 72% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 68 63% | 64 57% | 73 62% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 51% | 25 48% | 30 57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 56% | 7 37% | 7 37% |
| | English Language Learners | 6 40% | 6 38% | 10 56% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 83 79% | 85 76% | 91 78% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 72% | 37 71% | 40 75% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 47% | 7 39% | 8 42% |
| | English Language Learners | 10 67% | 9 56% | 13 72% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 35 | 21 | 25 | 40 | 42 | 33 | 52 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 47 | | 50 | 37 | | 56 | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 47 | 43 | 54 | 42 | 30 | 53 | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 60 | 45 | 72 | 48 | 33 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 45 | 35 | 60 | 41 | 33 | 50 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |
| 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 | 61 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 416 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 48 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, learning gains increased by 13% in ELA and 7% in Mathematics. Additionally, learning gains of the lowest 25% increased by 11% in ELA and 8% in Mathematics.

According to the progress monitoring tool (NWEA), students with disabilities consistently performed below proficient in ELA and Mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off the progress monitoring tool used (NWEA), students with disabilities consistently scored lower in proficiency than all other subgroups for ELA and Math.

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

Due to gaps in learning with ELA and math standards, some students with disabilities have significant challenges in accessing the grade level standards/curriculum. To increase proficiency, SWD must be provided access to grade level instruction with scaffolds in place to support a path to mastery. Additionally, small group support will occur daily with the general education teacher and the VE teacher.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off the progress monitoring tool used (NWEA), proficiency in math improved by 4% as compared to the 2018-2019 FSA data (61%-64%) and proficiency in science improved by 21% (54%-78%).

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

Teachers implemented SuccessMaker for all tier 2 math students. Gaps in learning were identified and students received instruction in small group as well as additional follow-up practice in the SuccessMaker program.

For science, hands on opportunities and collaborative structures were in place daily to support students mastery of the current and fair game science standards.

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

To accelerate learning, the following must occur:

1. Scaffolds must be in place to allow students to access grade level standards.
2. Essential standards must be identified.
3. Data must be analyzed to identify learning gaps.
4. Small group, differentiated instruction should occur daily.
5. Students must collaboratively work in groups.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The following professional learning opportunities will be provided for teachers:

1. Weekly Professional Learning Communities
2. Thinking Tuesday to plan with instructional coaches
3. Core Connections Writing Training.
4. MTSS one-on-one teacher data chats
5. District provided PD

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

Instructional coaches will continue to work with teachers using the coaching cycle to improve instruction. Grade levels will analyze data from NWEA, NSGRA, and SuccessMaker to make instructional decisions and improve student outcomes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on 2020-2021 FSA data, overall ELA proficiency decreased by 4% since the 2018-2019 school 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 and lowest quartile by at least 10% in each area and increase proficiency by at least 6%. Focus on the best practices in tier 1 instruction is a top priority. |
| Monitoring: | 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. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Candace Durinick (candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Monitoring -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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, NWEA Map Fluency, NSGRA and Osceola Writes three times a year, and district formatives twice a year.
6. 100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans.
7. Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.

8. First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development.
9. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development.
10. T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation.
11. T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation.
12. RISE reading for T2
13. Pre-Teaching strategies for T2

Person Responsible Candace Durinick (candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on 2020-2021 FSA data, math proficiency increased by 2% however, learning gains decreased by 16%. There is a concern in small group, targeted instruction, standards based planning , and student tasks. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Increase the percentage of learning gains and lowest quartile by 10%, and increase proficiency by at least 6%. Focus on math interventions will be a top priority. |
| Monitoring: | According to research, differentiated instruction is the most effective teaching strategy to improve student achievement (Slavin, Lake, & Groff, 2010). Additionally, tier 1 instruction is considered the key component of tiered instruction, all students receive instruction within an evidence-based, scientifically researched core program. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Monitoring -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to produce engaging lessons and analyze student data to make informed decisions. 6. Teachers will implement and monitor the SuccessMaker program to provide targeted student interventions in mathematics. <p>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)</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | |

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.
10. SuccessMaker daily use with tier 2 students.

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

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

Based on 2020-2021 data, science proficiency remained the same from the 2018-2019 school year. Student data indicates that instructional practices in place are not moving more students toward proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase the percentage of students proficient in science by 10%. Focus on hands on learning and collaboration with ELA is a priority.

Monitoring:

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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monitoring-

1. Teacher will meet weekly with the Math/Science 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 science instruction based on the data collected during classroom walkthroughs.
3. The Leadership Team will conduct CWT and feedback will be given to teachers.
4. The Math/Science Coach will model effective teaching strategies in the classroom.
5. Use and monitor formative assessment data to identify student gaps in learning.
6. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson.
7. Hands on Science incorporated in every lesson.

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

Faith Salvato (faith.salvato@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on students achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams.</p> <p>Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, and teacher leaders. These teams provide direction for schools to implement their most important strategic goals.</p> <p>It was found through the Insight Survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>On the 2020-2021 School Insight Survey, 50% of teachers responded that leaders at their school seek out feedback from teachers. For the 2021-2022 Insight Survey, that number will increase to 60%.</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>To have a true leadership team, that works beyond the operational management aspect of the school, the team must know their staffs strengths and weaknesses, allow for open communication, and establish trust that staff can take on instructional leadership opportunities.</p> <p>Having in place strong Professional Learning Communities allows for teachers to show their capacity as leaders, provide useful feedback, and promotes open lines of communication with the leadership team.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Alison Doe (alison.doe@osceolaschools.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Increase teacher leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve motivation and confidence in their own abilities. Through the development of these leadership roles, teachers will have more input in the decisions made by the leadership team.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Great leaders understand that teachers know their students-and what they themselves-need to succeed. When teachers are involved in making data based decisions that improve the success of students at their school, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on improving student outcomes.</p> <p>When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from each other, and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic, in which everyone plays a role and is valued, provides teachers an opportunity to work with colleges to refine their practices and improve student outcomes. This work also elevates teacher morale, transparency of practice and analysis of data are expected to drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold monthly PLC lead meetings.
2. Provide professional development to PLC leads on analyzing data and using that data to improve student outcomes.
3. Once a month, provide time for vertical PLCs where teachers can meet with multiple grade levels.
4. Place classroom teachers in leadership roles such a school PLC Facilitator and AVID Coordinator.
5. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day towards goals.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions, mindsets, and self regulation.

A positive school climate included a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provided the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.

Measurable Outcome: The 2020-2021 Panorama Survey showed that 62% of students answered the school climate at Hickory Tree is favorable. For the 2021-2022 Panorama Survey, that number will increase to 65%.

Monitoring: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Stake (jessica.stake@osceolaschool.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to access individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and Emotional learning 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).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions.
2. Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will implement SEL lessons in the classroom that target school climate.
5. Teachers will implement SEL competencies, including collaborative structures, in daily lesson plans as highlighted in the Curriculum Unit Plans.
6. Instructional coaches will model collaborative structures
7. Guidance Counselors will provide character lessons to all grade levels.
8. Teachers will incorporate Panorama lessons into their classroom activities.
9. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.
11. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

Person Responsible Jessica Stake (jessica.stake@osceolaschool.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | 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. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Increase the percentage of proficiency by at least 6%. Focus on the best practices in tier 1 instruction and interventions. |
| Monitoring: | 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. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Monitoring -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. <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> <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 Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned 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 Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Non applicable

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.

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.

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

Stakeholders at Hickory Tree Elementary are partners with school leadership making the school an optimal learning environment. Stakeholders influence the learning outcomes through active participation in school activities, programs, and support of instructional initiatives. Hickory Tree has the following group of stakeholders:

Students
Teachers
Administrators
Parents
Support Staff
Community Leaders

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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |