School District of Osceola County, FL

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Alison Doe

Start Date for this Principal: 5/20/2018

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

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.
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 reading and writing.
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.
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.
Sanders, Katrina	Other	Supports the implementation of the SIP. Oversee Professional Learning Communities and provides teachers with support and resources.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/20/2018, Alison Doe

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

Total number of students enrolled at the school
759

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	130	125	122	132	133	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	18	12	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	13	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	11	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	11	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	48%	56%				62%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	61%				62%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	47%	52%				55%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	47%	60%				61%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%	55%	64%				61%	59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	55%				43%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	43%	51%				54%	49%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	42	43	27	67	68	12				
ELL	44	59	50	52	63	40	39				
BLK	43			57							
HSP	55	63	64	58	69	52	44				
MUL	58			67							
WHT	59	61	38	63	65	44	52				
FRL	49	67	69	51	66	55	41				

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						
WHT	65	60	53	65	65	56	65				
FRL	57	59	48	52	55	40	49				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	52
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	50
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	59
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	63
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	55
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2021-2022 FSA data, learning gains increase by 10% (54%-64%) in ELA and 24% (45%-69%) in mathematics. Additionally, learning gains of the lowest 25% in creased by 10% (46%-56%) in ELA and 23% (32%-55%) in mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, proficiency decrease in ELA by 1% (58%-57%), mathematics by 2% (63%-61%) , and science by 9% (57%-48%).

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 learning gaps in ELA, Math and Science standards, some students had difficulty accessing grade level content. To increase proficiency, students who are being identified as below proficient must be provided scaffolded grade level instruction with clear targets for mastery. For these students, small group must support moving towards mastery of the standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA, the data component that showed the most improvement was in learning gains in mathematics. There was an increase of 24% points (45%-69%).

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

A deliberate focus was placed on small group math instruction and interventions. Monthly data chats were held to discuss student progress and teachers met weekly in PLCs to determine next steps for students.

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 formative assessments, district wide assessments, and unit assessments to make instructional decisions and improve student outcomes.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	If teachers participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement. Then student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA proficiency will increase by 7%. Science proficiency will increase by 25%. Mathematics proficiency will increase by 3%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Sanders (katrina.sanders@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	PLC is defined as "…an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in the assumption that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. Consequently, student learning is both the foundation and evidence of an effective PLC.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. PLC teams will develop and implement formulated meeting Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during all meetings.

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

2. Schools PLC's teams will meet four times a month during early release and this dedicated PLC time will be spent focused on working together as a team for student success purposes.

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

3. Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and PLC administrator.

Person Responsible Katrina Sanders (katrina.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

4. Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.

Person Responsible Katrina Sanders (katrina.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

5. Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team focused on the work.

Person Responsible Katrina Sanders (katrina.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

6. Each grade level or content area team will have an embedded leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process.

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

7. Teachers will plan together within their PLCs to incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible Alison Doe (alison.doe@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	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: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The 2021-2022Panorama Survey showed that 60% of students answered the school climate at Hickory Tree is favorable. For the 2022-2023 Panorama Survey, that number will increase to 65%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. AII surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture within the school. 2. The leadership team will review monthly during the Stocktake PBIS, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop inventions as required.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Stake (jessica.stake@osceolaschool.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.

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

2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.

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

3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time.

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

4. Teachers will implement SEL lessons in the classroom that target school climate.

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

6. Instructional coaches will model collaborative structures

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

7. Guidance Counselors will provide character lessons to all grade levels.

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

8. Teachers will incorporate Panorama lessons into their classroom activities.

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

9.Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.

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

10.The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions as required.

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

11.School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

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

12. PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the PBIS leadership team and reported out at monthly Stocktake.

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

13. PBIS training will be conducted by the district and the school PBIS leadership team for all staff throughout the year.

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

Guidance Counselors will provide college and career lessons to all grade levels to build a post-secondary culture.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, math proficiency decreased by 2%. Math learning increased by 24% and the learning gains of the lowest 25% increased by 23%. However, students moving from 4th to 5th grade, decreased in proficiency by 10%. There is a concern in small group, targeted instruction, standards based planning , and student tasks.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Math proficiency will increase by 3% in all groups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. Administrative team will monitor the use of the district adopted instructional materials and ensure they are being used with fidelity. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implementation of high quality core math instruction for all students that includes grade level standards based instruction as well as differentiated interventions and small group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	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.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

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

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.

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

3. Classroom walk-throughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback.

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

4. The math coach will model effective mathematics strategies in the classroom.

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

5. Use and monitor diagnostic and formative assessment data, including district formative assessments and unit assessments, in all tiers of instruction (one, two, and three).

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

6. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson.

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

8. Daily Math Talks will be included in lesson plans

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

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)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on 2021-2022 FSA data, overall ELA proficiency decreased by 1% since the 2020-2021 school year. There is a concern with planning and implementation of tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA proficiency will increase by7%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candace Durinick (candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Studies show that 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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).

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

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

2. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

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

3. Staff will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans.

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

4. Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.

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

5. 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.

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

6. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ word analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, prosody, and vocabulary and language development.

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

7. Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

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

8. Meetings weekly/bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students.

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

9. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

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

10. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback.

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

11. Tier 1 and Tier 2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 - 1 day/week during station rotation.

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

12. Tier 3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 - 2 days/week during station rotation.

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

13. Pre-Teaching strategies for T2.

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the 2021-2022 FSA dat, science proficiency decreased by 8% (54%-48%). Student data indicates that instructional practices in place are not moving more students toward proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Science proficiency will increase by 25%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction. 2. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Wright (jason.wright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	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 very lesson. 8. Science based texts incorporated in the ELA block. 9. Incorporation of literacy in the science block,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	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.

resources/criteria used for selecting this 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
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The math/science coach will lead the needs assessment, planning, learning, and monitoring of science instructional practices.

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

2. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback.

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

3. The math/science and literacy coach will model effective science/literacy strategies in the classroom.

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

4. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson.

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

5. 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.

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

6. PD will be provided to teachers by the Math/Science Coach based on data from Learning Cycle visits and daily CWT.

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

7. Teachers will implement the 5Es model as a part of their daily Science instruction.

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

8. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.

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

9. Work with school- and district-based science team to develop professional learning that address areas of need specific to science instructional practice and strategies.

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

10. Interactive science notebooks: Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, synthesizing information, and more. WICOR (AVID).

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Jan Richardson Next Steps in Guided Reading (Visible Learning effect size- phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: 60 moderate).

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

RISE/RISE UP accelerated intervention (Visible Learning effect size - small group learning: .47 promising) Easily implemented in grades 3-5 for students who are below grade level.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to the 2021-2022 NSGRA data, 52% of kindergarten students, 79% of first grade students, and 75% of second grade students were on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
For the 2022-2023 school year, ELA proficiency will increase by 3%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to the 2021-2022 FSA data, 53% of thirds grade students, 69% of fourth grade students, and 49% of fifth grade students were proficient of the ELA assessment.
For the 2022-2023 school year, ELA proficiency will increase by 7%.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.

2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Durinick , Candace , durinicc@osceola.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Grades K-2: Jan Richardson Next Steps in Guided Reading (Visible Learning effect size- phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: 60 moderate). Guided reading practices aligned to the district's Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and is aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T ELA standards.

Grades 3-5: RISE/RISE UP accelerated intervention (Visible Learning effect size - small group learning: .47 promising) Easily implemented in grades 3-5 for students who are below grade level. Guided reading practices aligned to the district's Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and is aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Researcher Anita laquinta describes guided reading as one of the “most important contemporary reading instructional practices in the United States” (Fawson & Reutzel, 2000). Informed by 40 years of research drawing from cognitive science and linguistic principles, guided reading supports all readers, including striving, advanced and English learners (Pearson 2019, Scharer 2019, Clay 2001, 2005, Fountas & Pinnell 2017). The small-group guided reading model allows teachers to target specific learning needs, provide appropriate scaffolding, and gradually reduce support to promote independence.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and teachers will be given feedback.	Durinick, Candace, candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Leadership: Meetings weekly/bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students.	Cruz Santiago, Duannieh, duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Coaching: During Thinking Tuesday with the Literacy Coach, instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.	Durinick, Candace, candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Coaching: The Literacy coaching will identify teachers needing support and complete a Coaching Cycle with the teacher providing feedback and next steps.	Durinick, Candace, candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net
Assessment: 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.	Durinick, Candace, candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net
Assessment: Students in grade K-5 will participate in progress monitoring assessments that will identify if students are on track to be proficient on statewide assessments.	Sanders, Katrina, katrina.sanders@osceolaschools.net
Professional Learning: Professional Development will be conducted for teachers on the NSGRA Assessment as well as Next Steps in Guided Reading. Training will be determined by teacher need and experience with guided reading.	Durinick , Candace , durinicc@osceola.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: Professional Development will be conducted for teachers on the RISE curriculum. Training will be determined by teacher need and experience with guided reading.	Durinick, Candace, candace.durinick@osceolaschools.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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
-Implementation of the Zones of Regulation

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 school culture and environment.

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