Hunters Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://hunterscreekes.ocps.net/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Bradley	Principal	The principal job duties include managing all aspects of the organization. Some of the responsibilities include: * 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
DePriest, Christie	Assistant Principal	Job duties include managing the school and its human and material resources. Produce evidence of effective teaching and all student learning. * 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
Soto, Gabriela	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * 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
Rivera Burke, Natasha	Magnet Coordinator	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * 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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ortiz Mendez, Lynmarie	Science Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * 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
Patterson, Ellen	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * 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	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. Job duties include: * 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

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team and teachers are provided opportunities to submit input about the SIP. Previous years' data was reviewed with teachers and staff at the beginning of the school year to identify

trends, strengths, and areas of growth. As a result of this analysis, school focus items were identified, which were used to create the areas of focus for the SIP. The school PTSA and SAC committees are also able to provide input during the review of the SIP during their respective meetings. Additionally, updates are provided throughout the school year during these meetings to discuss trends, and identify any additional need for revisions. Data from the Panorama teacher, staff, student, and family surveys are analyzed to identify areas of growth identified in the school SIP.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored regularly to ensure effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards. The instructional leadership team will monitor the academic progress and will meet weekly to discuss any concerns to be addressed. Additionally, the principal will meet with direct reports twice a month to discuss progress toward their respective content area as it relates to the SIP. Progress monitoring data will be reviewed throughout the school year to monitor student achievement data. Revisions will be made as needed based on progress monitoring data. Additional data points such as classroom walkthrough data, standards-based unit assessments, and intervention data will be monitored to determine effective implementation and impact on student achievement. The SIP will be reviewed with PTA as well as SAC to provide updates on progress throughout the school year. Revisions will be made as needed based on the culmination of data.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	7	25	28	36	25	20	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	35	27	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	21	26	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	26	35	35	0	0	0	0	111

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	8	17	35	23	0	0	0	92

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	20	31	32	48	15	34	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	32	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	26	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	9	27	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	20	31	32	48	15	34	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	32	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	26	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	9	27	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	57	53	67	56	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				66			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			67		
Math Achievement*	64	60	59	72	46	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				74			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			60		
Science Achievement*	66	63	54	67	61	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	59	59	54			66		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	310
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	4	2
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	54			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	59			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			64			66					54
SWD	16			14			5				5	8
ELL	54			55			54				5	55
AMI												
ASN	75			83							2	
BLK	57			50							2	
HSP	60			64			62				5	53
MUL												

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	73			67			73				5	62
FRL	54			56			48				5	53

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	66	52	72	74	56	67					54
SWD	21	44		22	43							7
ELL	52	56	52	61	65	50	54					54
AMI												
ASN	75	60		92	70							
BLK	55	69		45	64		60					
HSP	64	64	54	70	70	53	63					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	70		83	90		77					27
FRL	60	64	40	63	68	50	58					49

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	71	67	71	54	60	67					66
SWD	35			26								70
ELL	60	77	73	59	69	77	65					66
AMI												
ASN	73			80								
BLK	63			55			45					
HSP	69	77	65	68	57	67	69					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	53		82	53		65					82
FRL	69	70	69	59	49	54	70					61

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	54%	2%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	52%	2%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	51%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST data, math and science were our lowest performing data points at 66% proficiency. With the new standards, teachers had to make adjustments throughout the school year to deconstruct the standard, and facilitate instruction that aligned to the rigor of the standard. Additionally, students were administered the FAST assessment digitally, instead of paper-based as in previous years. Students experienced challenges with the change in the assessment platform.

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

As indicated in the previous question, the component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was Math. Math data decreased 6% from 72% proficient to 66% proficient. New standards were introduced for the 2021-2022 school year, with a different assessment (FAST) administered to monitor student progress. With the new standards, teachers had to make adjustments throughout the school year to deconstruct the standard, and facilitate instruction that aligned to the rigor of the standard. Additionally, students were administered the FAST assessment digitally, instead of paper-based as in previous years. Students experienced challenges with the change in the assessment platform.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST data, the component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade math. Raw data for PM3 indicate that the school proficiency was 53%, while the state proficiency was 55%. Trends that were identified include but were not limited to under or over scaffolding by teachers, misalignment to activities and questions aligned to the standard. Additionally, the FAST Math included new standards and a new platform for students to complete the assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade Math. Raw data for PM1 indicate that the school proficiency for 3rd grade was 9%. From PM1 to PM2, the percent of students proficient increased 26% from 9% to 35%. From PM1 to PM3, the percent of students proficient increased 56%, from 9% to 65%. Teachers incorporated note-taker and test taking strategies for students. Additionally, intentional group strategies were incorporated to provide small group instruction based on the needs and areas of growth for students. The shift from whole group to small group instruction allowed teachers to focus on the individual needs of students to implement strategic and prescriptive supports for students. Additionally, shifting the format of professional learning communities to focus on planning contributed to the improvement in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on EWS data from Part 1, the following are potential areas of concern.
1. The percent of students scoring Level 1 on ELA assessment increased 20%, from 55 students in 21-22, to 66 students in 22-23.
2. The percent of students scoring Level 1 on Math assessment increased 16%, from 44 students in 21-22, to 51 students in 22-23.
3. The percent of students with two or more indicators increase 104%, from 45 students in 21-22, to 92 students in 22-23.

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

1. Increase student achievement, learning gains, and close learning gaps for all students, KG through 5th grades in ELA.
2. Increase literacy for students in KG - 2nd grades.
3. Increase student achievement, learning gains, and close learning gaps for all students, KG through 5th grades in Math.
4. Increase student achievement for students in 5th grade in Science.
5. Promote a positive school culture for all stakeholders to increase sense of belonging at the school.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on school data, 67% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2022-2023 state assessment for ELA. Reading is critical to student achievement With 33% of students not proficient in ELA, additional supports are needed to increase ELA achievement levels and to close gaps.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, 70% 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 PMA, Exact Path, 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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, standards-based questioning strategies in their lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are not proficient in reading 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. Appropriate scaffolded instruction provides students with support to learn and become competent. It is important for teachers to provide appropriate scaffolds and gradually release students to learn and process independently.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Facilitate weekly PLCs for planning and implementation of standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Gabriela Soto (93660@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Implement SIPPS fluid intervention groups, Exact Path program usage data, Impact trainings,

Person Responsible: Gabriela Soto (93660@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024

Facilitate coaching cycles based on teacher areas of growth and provide written coaching and feedback on best practices to increase teacher capacity.

Person Responsible: Gabriela Soto (93660@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024 (Ongoing)

Based on subgroup data, 21% of students with disabilities are proficient in ELA. Students with disabilities currently receive support through support facilitation and or resource pullout delivery model with a varying exceptionality VE teacher based on needs identified by the IEP team on their current IEP. Additional actions will include increasing opportunities for tutoring for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 - May 2024 (Ongoing)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on school data, 66% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2022-2023 state assessment for math. Math was the lowest school academic component. Students struggled with number sense and operations which requires additional support 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 2023-2024 school year, 70% 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 Successmaker Math, 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Hunter's Creek Elementary teachers will provide intensive standards-based math instruction. Teachers will incorporate scaffolding strategies to gradually release students to learn and process content. Teachers will incorporate anchor charts to assist students in learning concepts, as well as interactive notebooks for students to organize content. Teachers will incorporate standards-based questioning strategies to increase engagement. Students will also use Success Maker Math to support their academic needs. Teachers will incorporate real-world, hands-on learning opportunities for students to master the standards as well as manipulatives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are not proficient in 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. Current trends identified during classroom walkthroughs support the need for appropriate scaffolding, questioning strategies, and interactive notebooks to increase math achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Facilitate weekly PLCs for planning and implementation of standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Natasha Rivera Burke (natasha.riveraburke@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024

Use of manipulatives, addressing misconceptions in math planning, fluency practice using Reflex Math, PD on how to use SAVASS for small group math interventions.

Person Responsible: Natasha Rivera Burke (natasha.riveraburke@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024

Facilitate coaching cycles based on teacher areas of growth and provide written coaching and feedback on best practices to increase teacher capacity.

Person Responsible: Natasha Rivera Burke (natasha.riveraburke@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024 (Ongoing)

Based on student data, 22% of students with disabilities were proficient in math. Students will receive support through support facilitation and or resource pullout delivery model. Increase opportunities for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on school data, 66% of students were proficient (scoring level 3 or more) on the 2022-2023 state assessment for Science. Science was the school's lowest component and additional supports are needed to increase Science achievement levels at all grade levels.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, 70% 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 Exact Path, Measuring Up, 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Hunter's Creek Elementary teachers will provide intensive standards-based instruction science instruction.
. 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 through science labs. Teachers will incorporate science close-reads in ELA to increase exposure to science text. Teachers will incorporate interactive notebooks for students to organize content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Classroom walkthrough data trends show that students need additional scaffolding to learn science content. Trends show that teachers are over-scaffolding and under-scaffolding content. Through scaffolding, students will productively struggle, with supports, through the gradual release process.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Facilitate weekly PLCs for planning and implementation of standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Lynmarie Ortiz Mendez (lynmarie.ortizmendez@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024 (Ongoing)

Incorporate science close-reads in center rotations during ELA block to provide exposure to science text.

Person Responsible: Lynmarie Ortiz Mendez (lynmarie.ortizmendez@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023 to May 2024 (Ongoing)

Facilitate coaching cycles based on teacher areas of growth and provide written coaching and feedback on best practices to increase teacher capacity.

Person Responsible: Lynmarie Ortiz Mendez (lynmarie.ortizmendez@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 to May 2024 (Ongoing)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 2022-2023 data collected through the annual Panorama Survey, 64% of teachers felt positively about the coaching and feedback they received throughout the school year. This represents +8% from the 2021-2022 school year. Additional steps are needed to increase the percent of teachers with a positive feeling toward coaching and feedback.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, 67% of teachers responding to the annual Panorama Survey will feel positively about the coaching and feedback they receive throughout the school year.

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

Quarterly surveys administered by the school principal will be used to monitor the desired outcome. Additionally, written and verbal feedback provided to individual teachers, in professional learning community meetings, and in staff meetings (based on trends) will be used to monitor the desired outcome. The percent of teachers with a favorable rating on the Panorama Survey will be used to monitor the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will receive written and verbal feedback by instructional coaches and administration on best practices to build teacher capacity. Teachers will be tiered to determine the level of coaching and support needed to improve their practice. Coaches will use the facilitative coaching cycles to provide guidance, modeling, feedback, and support to teachers on areas of growth. Additionally, weekly newsletters (Panther Press) will be sent to all staff with strategies to improve teacher capacity and pedagogy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers, at all levels, can benefit from coaching and feedback to build capacity and increase pedagogical skillsets to ensure effective instruction is delivered to students. Tiering teachers will allow coaches to identify areas of growth that will be addressed weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly. Coaching cycles and feedback to teachers produces significant effect size to increase student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Increase feedback and coaching for teachers to build teacher capacity and efficacy.

Person Responsible: Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023-May 2024

Increase school culture through staff recognition, snack carts, teacher gatherings.

Person Responsible: Bradley Martin (bradley.martin@ocps.net)

By When: From August 2023-May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school principal reviews the school budget weekly to monitor funds. The School Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets weekly to discuss progress toward school goals. Resources, personnel allocation, and additional funding for materials and resources is discussed to determine current levels of effectiveness for each area. The School Improvement Plan is reviewed with the School Advisory Council (SAC) at the beginning of the school year and monthly updates are provided to monitor progress toward goals. During SAC meetings, resources and funding are discussed to determine if additional action steps are needed to accomplish school goals. Additional resources, supplemental curriculum, supplies, etc. have been purchased, and additional items are purchased throughout the school year for ELA, Math, and Science to ensure teachers and students have what they need to be successful. Additionally, incentive items have been purchased and will be purchased as needed to build positive school culture for teacher retention.