

Orange County Public Schools

Hunters Creek Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://hunterscreekes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://hunterscreekes.ocps.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	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Martin, Bradley	Principal	<p>The principal job duties include managing all aspects of the organization. Some of the responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Work with district-level administrators, superintendents, faculty, and staff to ensure the smooth running of schools * Work with the leadership team and teachers to set performance goals * Hiring and evaluating staff * Visiting classrooms and providing constructive feedback * Prepare budget * Coordinating student master schedules and staff schedules * Oversee the development of curriculum * Ensure school board policies are followed * Tracking of all student progress in all content areas
McMurtry, Leanda	Assistant Principal	<p>Job duties include managing the school and its human and material resources. Produce evidence of effective teaching and all student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Work with the leadership team and teachers to set performance goals * Hiring and evaluating staff * Visiting classrooms and providing constructive feedback * Prepare budget * Coordinating student master schedules and staff schedules * Oversee the development of curriculum * Ensure school board policies are followed * Tracking of all student progress in all content areas
DePriest, Christie	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Works closely with teachers to provide effective constructive feedback * Guides teachers through the coaching cycle * Follows up on instructional modifications based on feedback * Support grade level team leader during professional learning community meetings * Plans and provides professional development to staff

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Collect and analyze grade level data to develop instructional strategies to increase student achievement
Patterson, Ellen	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Works closely with teachers to provide effective constructive feedback * Guides teachers through the coaching cycle * Follows up on instructional modifications based on feedback * Support grade level team leader during professional learning community meetings * Plans and provides professional development to staff * Collect and analyze grade level data to develop instructional strategies to increase student achievement
Huertas, Zaida	School Counselor	<p>The school guidance counselor supports the social emotional growth of our students by coordinating professional development for instructional staff and collaborating with school staff, parents and the community to create a safe and respectful learning environment.</p> <p>Job duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Help students attain an optimum level of personal and social adjustment * Supports the implementation of the adopted social emotional program, Sanford Harmony * Consult with parents, teachers, administrators, and supporting agencies concerning the needs and abilities of students * Communicate effectively with all members of the school district and community * Work effectively with community organizations * Support the value of education

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/12/2022, Bradley Martin

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.*

2

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

791

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

6

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

11

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	28	111	118	142	90	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	20	31	32	48	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	0	0	9	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	0	1	0	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Friday 8/12/2022

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	111	126	134	110	142	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	767
Attendance below 90 percent	17	23	25	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	111	126	134	110	142	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	767
Attendance below 90 percent	17	23	25	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	67%	56%	56%				70%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						63%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						48%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	72%	46%	50%				77%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						63%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						37%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	61%	59%				66%	56%	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	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
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	21	44		22	43						
ELL	52	56	52	61	65	50	54				
ASN	75	60		92	70						
BLK	55	69		45	64		60				
HSP	64	64	54	70	70	53	63				
WHT	78	70		83	90		77				
FRL	60	64	40	63	68	50	58				
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			26							
ELL	60	77	73	59	69	77	65				
ASN	73			80							
BLK	63			55			45				
HSP	69	77	65	68	57	67	69				
WHT	82	53		82	53		65				
FRL	69	70	69	59	49	54	70				
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	23	33	17	28	35	21					
ELL	62	59	47	70	61	39	48				
ASN	79	90		85	50						
BLK	60	46		60	46						
HSP	69	61	49	75	62	36	62				
WHT	76	68		84	75		77				
FRL	61	57	48	69	61	36	53				

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	64
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	62
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	71
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	57
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 a review of school data, proficiency in ELA decreased from 2019 to 2022 from an average of 62% proficient to 60% proficient across grade levels. For Math, proficiency decreased from an average of 70% to 66% proficient across grade levels. Science proficiency increased from 58% proficient to 61% proficient. ELA proficiency for SWD shows a downward trend over three years (23%, 35%, 21%), and a downward trend for ELL students (62%, 60%, 52%). Math proficiency for SWD shows a downward trend over the past three years (28%, 26%, 22%), and a downward trend for ELL students (70%, 59%, 61%).

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

Based on an analysis of 2022 state assessment and progress monitoring data, the components demonstrating the greatest need for improvement are ELA and Math achievement. ELA proficiency data decreased from 62% proficient (raw data) across grade levels to 60% proficient (raw data) across grade levels.

Based on grade level data analysis, 3rd grade ELA proficiency decreased from 66% to 60%, 4th grade ELA proficiency decreased from 66% to 61%. Fifth-grade ELA proficiency increased 6% from 54% to 60%.

For Math achievement, proficiency data indicate a decrease from 70% proficient (raw data) to 66% proficient (raw data). Based on grade-level data analysis, 3rd grade Math proficiency decreased 13% from 78% to 65%. Fourth-grade Math proficiency data and fifth-grade proficiency data remained the same.

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

Enrollment at Hunter's Creek ES increased throughout the course of the 21-22 school year. Students new to the school and new to the country required additional levels of ELL supports and accommodations in the classroom. Classroom walkthrough data indicated the need for additional supports through scaffolding of instruction. Observation data showed teachers were either over-scaffolding, or under-scaffolding instruction, leading to students' inability to master content independently. Staff will be provided with additional support to effectively scaffold instruction for students and to provide appropriate interventions for students.

Based on 2021-2022 data, achievement gaps existed for students who are ELL. Students who are ELL currently receive, and will continue to receive support through three bilingual (2 Spanish | 1 Portuguese) paraprofessionals who conduct both push-in and pull-out support. Additionally, students who are ELL may receive additional push-in support through Tier I Intervention teacher. Additional pull-out support from the leadership team will occur when triage groupings are created. Based on 2021-2022 data, achievement gaps existed for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities fell under the 41% federal index for HCES. Students with disabilities currently receive support through support facilitation delivery model with a Varying Exceptionality (VE) teacher based on needs identified by the IEP team on their current IEP. Additionally, students may receive additional push-in support through Tier I Intervention teacher. Additional pull-out support from the leadership team will occur when triage groupings are created.

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

Based on an analysis of 2022 progress monitoring and state assessment data, 5th grade ELA proficiency scores, and 5th grade Science proficiency showed the most improvement. Fifth-grade ELA proficiency scores increased from 54% proficient to 60% proficient. Fifth-grade Science scores increased from 58% to 61% proficient.

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

The actions that contributed to this improvement was due to effective and consistent collaboration within the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) as the analyzed data and implemented actions based on the data. Teachers were provided with professional development focused on effective scaffolding strategies. Additionally, intervention groups were formed based on student need and ability to ensure effective interventions were implemented.

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

Student progress monitoring and diagnostic data will be collected and triangulated to determine needs of students and grouping. Teachers will incorporate effective interventions using either a walk-to model, or a homeroom model. Progress monitoring during core group instruction will help teachers identify gaps in student learning. These gaps will then receive targeted focus during small group and Enrichment/Intervention. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success.

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.

Professional Development will focus on identifying students with a need for acceleration, effective use of high-yield strategies for students with disabilities, and effective acceleration in small groups. Additional

professional development will focus on effective scaffolding strategies and questioning strategies. Questioning strategies will focus on implementing higher-order thinking, standards-based questions to students.

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

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will focus on common planning and teacher collaboration. PLC's will focus on four guiding questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Leadership team members will also attend weekly PLCs to provide guidance and support. Instructional coaches will provide guidance on deconstructing the standards, planning lessons, and implementing best practices. The school staffing specialist will attend PLCs and provide guidance to teachers to support SWD. The school ELL Compliance Specialist (ECS) will attend PLCs and provide guidance to teachers to support ELL students.

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 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 school data, 67% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2021-2022 state assessment for ELA. Additional supports are needed to increase ELA achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2022-2023 school year, 73% of students at Hunter's Creek Elementary School taking the FAST ELA Assessment will score level 3 or above.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Classroom walkthrough data, student data from iReady, Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), classroom assignments, and frequent formative assessments will be used for monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Hunter's Creek Elementary teachers will provide intensive standards-based instruction and reading instruction. Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success.

Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Teachers will incorporate evidence-based scaffolding strategies and higher-order thinking questioning strategies in their lessons. Teachers will incorporate real-world, hands-on learning opportunities for students to master the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

Students who are not proficient in reading or math require differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed level, in addition, to the regular standards based instruction will help close the achievement gap for all students, especially the students with disabilities.

Students with disabilities currently receive support through support facilitation delivery model with a Varying Exceptionality VE teacher based on needs identified by the IEP team on their current IEP. Additionally, students may receive additional push-in support through Tier I Intervention teacher. Additional

used for selecting this strategy. pull-out support from the leadership team will occur when triage groupings are created.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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 school data, 72% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2021-2022 state assessment for Math. Additional supports are needed to increase Math achievement levels.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

For the 2022-2023 school year, 77% of students at Hunter's Creek Elementary School taking the FAST Math Assessment will score level 3 or above.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Classroom walkthrough data, student data from iReady, Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), classroom assignments, and frequent formative assessments will be used for monitoring. Additionally, student data from Symphony Math will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

Hunter's Creek Elementary teachers will provide intensive standards-based math instruction. Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success.

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Teachers will incorporate evidence-based scaffolding strategies and higher-order thinking questioning strategies in their lessons. Students will also use Symphony Math to support their academic needs. Teachers will incorporate real-world, hands-on learning opportunities for students to master the standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria**

Students who are not proficient in reading or math require differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed level, in addition, to the regular standards based instruction will help close the achievement gap for all students, especially the students with disabilities.

Students with disabilities currently receive support through support facilitation delivery model with a Varying Exceptionality VE teacher based on needs identified by the IEP team on their current IEP. Additionally, students may

used for selecting this strategy. receive additional push-in support through Tier I Intervention teacher. Additional pull-out support from the leadership team will occur when triage groupings are created.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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 school data, 67% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2021-2022 state assessment for Science. Additional supports are needed to increase Science achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2022-2023 school year, 73% of students at Hunter's Creek Elementary School taking the state assessment in Science will score level 3 or above.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Classroom walkthrough data, student data from iReady, Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), classroom assignments, and frequent formative assessments will be used for monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

Hunter's Creek Elementary teachers will provide intensive standards-based instruction science instruction. Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success.

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Teachers will incorporate evidence-based scaffolding strategies and higher-order thinking questioning strategies in their lessons. Teachers will incorporate real-world, hands-on learning opportunities for students to master the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

Students who are not proficient in reading, math, or science require differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed level, in addition, to the regular standards based instruction will help close the achievement gap for all students, especially the students with disabilities.

Students with disabilities currently receive support through support facilitation delivery model with a Varying Exceptionality VE teacher based on needs identified by the IEP team on their current IEP. Additionally, students may

used for selecting this strategy.

receive additional push-in support through Tier I Intervention teacher. Additional pull-out support from the leadership team will occur when triage groupings are created.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and districtwide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff