School District of Osceola County, FL

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hickory Tree Elementary School

2355 OLD HICKORY TREE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

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, 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
Doe, Alison	Principal	
Durinick, Candace	Instructional Coach	
Sanders, Katrina	Instructional Coach	
Cruz Santiago, Duannieh	Instructional Coach	
Wagner, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Ortiz, German	Instructional Coach	
Albino, Kristal	School Counselor	

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.

School goals are developed based on state assessment data. Trends are gathered and plans of action are put in place for professional development, standard alignment and implementation and support for staff and students. This information is shared with SAC to gather input before submitting to the state. If the SAC requests changes, the leadership team will review and adjust the SIP to fit the needs of the community.

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))

Goals are monitored using both common and formative assessments, CIM trackers in School City, educlimber data and any other resources used to track our progress towards school goals. Updates are

shared with SAC both in September and January. Adjustments will be made throughout the year based on student's need and performance.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	10	16	10	11	14	18	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	10
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	51	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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	4	6	7	0	11	8	0	0	0	36
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	0	19	18	12	13	18	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	1	0	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	13	25	10	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	11	9	8	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	12	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	11	0	0	0	37
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	1	2	11	10	8	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	19	18	12	13	18	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	1	0	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	13	25	10	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	11	9	8	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	12	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	11	0	0	0	37
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	1	2	11	10	8	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	59	44	53	57	48	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				64			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			46		
Math Achievement*	69	46	59	61	44	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				69			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			32		
Science Achievement*	62	43	54	48	46	59	57		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	67			61		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
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	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
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	32	Yes	4	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	56			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	59			

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%
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	56			

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	59			69			62					57
SWD	23			33			22				5	63
ELL	49			62			44				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50							2	
HSP	55			65			52				5	56
MUL	60			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	63			77			76				4	
FRL	54			62			54				5	54

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	57	64	56	61	69	55	48					67
SWD	22	42	43	27	67	68	12					
ELL	44	59	50	52	63	40	39					67
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	43			57								
HSP	55	63	64	58	69	52	44					65
MUL	58			67								
PAC												
WHT	59	61	38	63	65	44	52					
FRL	49	67	69	51	66	55	41					52

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	58	54	46	63	45	32	57					61
SWD	35	21	25	40	42	33	52					
ELL	50	47		50	37		56					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	52	47	43	54	42	30	53					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	60	45	72	48	33	60					
FRL	53	45	35	60	41	33	50					57

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	59%	44%	15%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	49%	12%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	48%	27%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	41%	31%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	40%	18%	51%	7%

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.

The only data that Hickory Tree did not surpass the state average, in fact we tied with the state, is third grade ELA at 50%. This group of students coming in scored slightly lower during the prior year in NWEA , so coming in we planned for more small group instruction and had more tier 3 students.

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

In comparing the FSA data to FAST data, the grade level cohort that had declined was fourth grade to fifth. ELA went from 69% proficient to 59% proficient and in math from 81% proficient to 72 % proficient. I feel the decline in data is due to different assessments being used to measure.

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.

This past year our school outperformed the state average in ELA, Math, and Science. Third grade ELA had a lower starting point at the start of the school year and had slower progress throughout the year. This cohort was in kindergarten during the start of COVID and this had an impact on their learning.

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

Based on state data, our science scores showed great improvement. We focused on science text during intervention time, implemented reading annotation during science instruction, targeted students for additional support who were close to earning a level 3 during intervention and after school tutoring.

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

Hickory Tree will be focusing on both ELA and Science proficiency for our ESE students,

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

Hickory Tree will be focusing on both ELA and Science proficiency for our ESE students, Hickory Tree will also be focusing on increasing our Science proficiency from 63% to 66%, by offering reading strategies for our math and science teachers.

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 2022-2023 FAST data, ELA proficiency increased by 2% to 59%. However, the incoming 3rd grade students are currently only 47% proficient. This group of students will count twice for proficiency in the 2023-2024 school year. There is a concern in small group, targeted instruction, standards-based planning, and aligned student tasks.

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 3% by all our students. Students with SWD will increase their proficiency by at least 1% based on tier 1 instruction and interventions.

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 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.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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).

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.

1. Teachers will meet 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)

By When: Weekly throughout the year.

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)

By When: Data will be reviewed bi-weekly and presented monthly during Stocktake.

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)

By When:

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)

By When:

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)

By When:

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)

By When:

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

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

By When:

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)

By When:

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)

By When:

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

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

By When:

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)

By When:

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)

By When:

13. Pre-Teaching strategies for T2.

Person Responsible: Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Well-implemented programs designed to foster Life Skills that are associated with positive outcomes. Life skills include: 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.

HTE will increase the sense of belonging on our campus by increasing PBIS student involvement, AVID Buddies and building student teacher relationships. Students will meet with their AVID Buddies monthly and PBIS events will increase 100% from 3 events to 6. HTE will add 3 parent nights as well.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.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.)

PBIS and AVID interventions will be be provided to students or classes based on Panorama data or tier 2 interventions focusing on specific skills that they are struggling with, This will be done during lunch bunches by members of the leadership team.

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

PBIS and AVID interventions work to increase student

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.

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students, specific with AVID callbacks, collaboration strategy and implementation in the classroom monthly

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be implemented by the last Friday for the following months: August, October, November, January, February, April, May.

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

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When: During monthly data Stocktakes, leadership team will meet to review students sense of belonging and what more or less needs to be done. Lunch bunches are fluid, meaning students can be added or removed if responding to interventions.

3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

5. Teachers will implement SEL competencies, including collaborative structures, in daily lesson plans as highlighted in the Curriculum Unit Plans and Xello lessons

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

By When:

6. Instructional coaches will model collaborative structures.

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

By When:

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

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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

Person Responsible: Beverly Hutchinson (beverly.hutchinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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

Person Responsible: Kristal Albino (kristal.albino@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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

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

By When:

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

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

By When:

#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 the 2022-2023 data, science proficiency increased by 15% (48%-63%). Student data indicates that instructional practices in place are moving more students toward proficiency. However, students with disabilities are only 22% proficient.

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 3%. SWD students will increase proficiency through both tier i instruction and interventions, using science text to reinforce proficiency.

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:

German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.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.)

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.
10. PD to practice with Literacy Coach annotating texts and best practices in reading.
11. Coordination of collaborative structures (WICOR) between AVID coordinator and academic coaches.

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

Research states, the same knowledge and skills that drive higher reading comprehension also drive higher science comprehension. Students need to develop scientific literacy in order to increase proficiency. Teachers will participate in authentic collaborative teams to produce engaging lessons and analyze student data to make informed decisions.

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.

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.

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

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

By When:

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

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

By When:

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

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

By When:

4. Implementation of collaborative structures in every lesson.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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: German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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

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

By When:

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)

By When:

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: German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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: German Ortiz (german.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When:

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 instructional coaches work with our ESE teachers and general education teachers to ensure that our students with disabilities are getting the instruction they need to succeed. During Thinking Tuesdays, planning with CUPS, reviewing assessments and Check In on weekly checks will help provide additional resources for both the ESE teachers and general education teachers to use with our students. Instructional Coaches also model lessons and work with students during intervention times to help students master standards and learning targets. Updates during data chats or weekly Thinking Tuesday allows for adaption of plans of action if needed throughout the school year.