Hunters Creek Middle

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hunters Creek Middle

13400 TOWN LOOP BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://hunterscreekms.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Moukaddam, Joumana	Principal
Flanagan, Kevin	Assistant Principal
Sims, Nicole	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Joumana Mokaddam, Principal- focuses on overall instructional practices throughout the school with an
emphasis on Math, Science and support departments.

Kevin Flanagan, Assistant Principal (Digital Curriculum)- focuses on integration of technology into instructional practices with an emphasis on Social Studies, Fine Arts, and Technology electives.

Nicole Sims, Assistant Principal (MTSS/Curriculum leader)- focuses on intervention instructional practices throughout the school with an emphasis on Language Arts, Reading, Foreign Language Electives, and Physical Education.

Shedrick Copeland, Dean, 8th grade- focuses on instructional practices within the science department and 8th grade level courses.

Dominic Golia, Dean 7th Grade- focuses on instructional practices within the Language Arts department and 7th grade level courses.

Brian Ursic, Dean, Dean, 6th grade- focuses on instructional practices within the Social Studies department and 6th grade level courses.

Kelly Armstrong, Guidance Counselor, Co-Team Leader- supports 8th grade courses, teachers, students, and parents.

Joel Anderson, Guidance Counselor, Co-Team Leader- supports 6th grade courses, teachers, students, and parents.

Sejal Shah, Guidance Counselor, Co-Team Leader- supports 7th grade courses, teachers, students, and parents.

Allison Nicosia, Instructional Coach- Focuses on digital instructional strategies as a member of the Digital Leadership Team

Joquetta Carter, MTSS Coordinator--Oversees MTSS student monitoring, push in student assistance, and individualized data collection and student intervention plans.

Kelle Moye, Reading and Writing interventions- Focuses on reading and writing instructional practices as the Language Arts Department Chairperson

Amy Pratt, Math interventions- focuses on math instructional practices and intervention as Math Department Chairperson.

Marielie Frontanez, Science interventions- focuses on science instructional practices and intervention as Science Department Chairperson

Athena Occhipinti, Social Studies interventions- focuses on social studies instructional practices and intervention as Social Studies Department Chairperson

Joley Dominguez-Lozada, Curriculum Compliance- focuses on ELL instructional strategies schoolwide
and support ELL students, parents, and teachers.

Yajaira Carratala, ESE Placement Specialist- focuses on ESE instructional strategies and supports ESE students, parents, and teachers.

Kimberly Drake, PASS monitor- focuses on Restorative Justice program

Classroom teachers- focus on effective instructional practices to increase student achievement,

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	45	50	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	48	33	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	115	194	0	0	0	0	386
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	113	107	0	0	0	0	317

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	74	108	0	0	0	0	248

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	43	28	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	27	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	136	120	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	119	72	0	0	0	0	269

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	88	61	0	0	0	0	197

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	43	28	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	27	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	136	120	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	119	72	0	0	0	0	269

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	88	61	0	0	0	0	197

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

For school wide data, the lowest 25% in ELA scored only 62% on grade level. While this area is trending as the lowest score in both 2017 and 2018, the performance of these students has increased by 8 percentage points.

For individual grade data, the lowest scores came in 6th grade math with only 42% of students scoring at or above grade level. This is abnormal as last year the 6th grade math had 60% of students at or above grade level.

Additionally ELL students, demonstrated a 45.2% achievement gap in ELA when compared with non-ELL students. This achievement gap in ELA has been consistent at Hunter's Creek Middle School based on year to year data trends.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

For school wide data, the largest year to year drop occurred in civics. Students performing at or above grade level fell from 85% to 77% from 2017 to 2018.

For individual grade data, the large year to year drop occurred in 6th grade math. Students performing at or above grade level from 605 to 42% from 2017 to 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

For school wide indicators, Hunter's Creek Middle School exceeds all state scores for all categories. The largest gap can be found in ELA achievement where HCMS outperforms the state score by 19 percentage points.

On the grade level indicators, Hunter's Creek Middle School largest gap can be found in 6th grade math achievement scores. HCMS performed 10 percentage points lower than the state average of 52%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component with the most improvement at the school level was an increase in the achievement levels for the lowest 25% in ELA. Student achievement levels in this area increased from 54% to 62% from 2017 to 2018.

At the grade level, the data component with the most improvement was the 8th grade math achievement which increased from 56% to 64%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

During the 2017-2018 school year, Hunter's Creek Middle School participated in the district professional learning community focused on reading across all content area. A team of teacher leaders attend DPLC meeting to focus on close reading strategies that could be employed in all classrooms. Teacher leaders then supported the entire faculty in implementing research based close reading strategies in the classroom to increase reading mastery. As part of the DPLC process, content area teachers employed reading strategies imbedded with content standards and scope and sequence to Implement Florida State Standards-based instruction through facilitation of effective collaborative planning using content specific complex texts and standards-aligned tasks in order to increase student achievement.

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	52%	53%	72%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	50%	54%	63%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	42%	47%	55%	44%	45%
Math Achievement	76%	53%	58%	79%	53%	55%
Math Learning Gains	68%	51%	57%	68%	53%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	44%	51%	63%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	69%	51%	52%	67%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	68%	72%	81%	67%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	34 (29)	45 (43)	50 (28)	129 (100)
One or more suspensions	29 (34)	48 (42)	33 (27)	110 (103)
Course failure in ELA or Math	77 (62)	115 (136)	194 (120)	386 (318)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	97 (78)	113 (119)	107 (72)	317 (269)

Grade Level Data
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
06	2018	58%	48%	10%	52%	6%
	2017	65%	52%	13%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	62%	48%	14%	51%	11%
	2017	62%	52%	10%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2018	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
	2017	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	42%	35%	7%	52%	-10%
	2017	60%	43%	17%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	64%	51%	13%	54%	10%
	2017	69%	52%	17%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2018	64%	32%	32%	45%	19%
	2017	56%	30%	26%	46%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	61%	49%	12%	50%	11%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	70%	66%	4%	71%	-1%
2017	75%	67%	8%	69%	6%
Compare		-5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	93%	61%	32%	62%	31%
2017	93%	53%	40%	60%	33%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	97%	65%	32%	56%	41%
2017	100%	43%	57%	53%	47%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	53	48	36	47	50	21	40	75		
ELL	45	62	63	57	62	57	38	57	91		
ASN	84	72	79	87	72	62	89	85	94		
BLK	58	57	55	65	57	69	44	74	87		
HSP	66	63	63	70	65	60	63	71	89		
MUL	93	75		90	79		77	82	90		
WHT	79	67	57	83	74	74	77	83	90		
FRL	63	62	60	67	63	63	59	70	89		

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	41	32	48	62	57	19	69	63		
ELL	43	61	54	58	68	58	32	65	91		
ASN	89	77	69	88	74	63	86	97	92		
BLK	61	57	44	64	66	64	55	72	88		
HSP	64	64	51	76	71	69	55	84	89		
MUL	86	77		87	78		85	87	92		
WHT	77	68	57	82	72	56	77	85	90		
FRL	62	62	53	73	69	62	53	81	88		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Focus on accelerated student learning
Rationale	Close reading uncovers layers of meaning that lead to deep comprehension of a text. Close, analytic reading stresses engaging with a text of sufficient complexity directly and examining meaning thoroughly and methodically, encouraging students to read and reread deliberately. Directing student attention on the text itself empowers students to understand the central ideas and key supporting details. It also enables students to reflect on the meanings of individual words and sentences; the order in which sentences unfold; and the development of ideas over the course of the text, which ultimately leads students to arrive at an understanding of the text as a whole. "Reading closely" means developing a deep understanding and a precise interpretation of a literary passage that is based first and foremost on the words themselves. A close reading does not stop there; rather, it embraces larger themes and ideas evoked and/or implied by the passage itself.
Intended Outcome	Implement Florida State Standards-based instruction through facilitation of effective collaborative planning using content specific complex texts, standards-aligned tasks, rigorous discussions, and evidence-based writing in all content areas in order to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps in relevant subgroups.
Point Person	Kellee Moye (kellee.moye@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	Through the District Professional Learning Community, a team of cross-curricular teachers will attend trainings that focus on goals that relate to the area of focus. These trainings will be throughout the year with the team being trained by experts in the field then filtered down to the school-base site then into classrooms. After each district training, a next-steps notetaker is completed by the DPLC team to implement. These next steps may include professional development, peer or guided observations, PLC collaborative activities, or any others that are created after the district training.

Continued year 1 DPLC goals:
Using close reading strategies such as annotating, rereading the text, and think pair and share. All teachers will use content specific complex texts to develop text dependent questions to determine what the text states, the central idea, theme, and analyzing development. All teachers will teach strategies for participating in rigorous discussion and responding to text dependent questions incorporating techniques to increase engagement of all students (e.g. ELL, ESE, FRL).
All teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to select and use strategies for close reading, rigorous discussion, and responding to text dependent questions.

The year 2 DPLC goals:
Using close reading strategies, all students will use complex texts as the basis for participating in rigorous discussions and responding to text dependent questions. Text complexity should include quantitative and qualitative indicators.
All students will use strategies and tools to organize their thinking to prepare for writing in response to complex texts, across all content areas. Students will paraphrase to infer, summarize sections of text, ask critical questions, analyze purpose, and evaluate significance.

Literacy Targets:
Using close reading strategies, use content specific complex texts to develop text dependent questions. |

Teach strategies for participating in rigorous discussion and responding to text dependent questions.
Plan and facilitate opportunities for students to select and use strategies for close reading, rigorous discussion, and responding to text dependent questions.

Leadership Targets:
Use strategies for building and sustaining high performing teams in order to support a culture of continuous improvement.
Utilize distributive leadership strategies to build sustainable teacher leadership.
Plan, implement, monitor, and modify cycles of professional learning.
Use strategies that increase collective efficacy and pedagogical expertise through processes around opening up classroom practice.
Use principles of responsive facilitation to support implementation of cycles of professional learning.

The district and school-based trainings this year will focus on moving teachers and leadership through the DPLC scale for the second year around these learning goals and targets.

Person Responsible	Kellee Moye (kellee.moye@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	The DPLC team will have planned observations, trainings, self-assessments, face-to-face professional developments, and digital professional developments to help ensure that the information they are bringing to the school is being implemented effectively.
	Peer observations including guided observations and other peer observations where peers and teacher-leaders will have focused observations to ensure the effectiveness of the task.
	Administration will formally and informally observe teachers when implementing the focus.
	Coaching observations by the Instructional Coach, Reading Coach, and other school-based teacher leaders will allow for feedback and monitoring of the effectiveness.
	Lesson Plans and Focus Calendars are required to include each unit's close reading activity which will allow administration and other leaders to ensure that they are observing teachers during the planned close reading activity to monitor effectiveness.
	PLC meetings will be visited by administration weekly allowing them to be part of the conversations when planning lessons that meet the area of focus.
	Data chats in PLCs will also be monitored by administration allowing them to listen to conversations around the effectiveness of the strategies in each classroom.
Person Responsible	Nicole Sims (41304@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Focusing on closing the achievement gap
Rationale	Achievement gaps are related to school specific environmental factors. Specifically a high influx of first generation ELL students who have limited English proficiency. This translates to an achievement gap between ELL students and the general population that is not apparent in LY/LF students with higher levels of English Proficiency. Targeting pre-instructional interventions would introduce students to key concepts, critical vocabulary, and foundational knowledge before instruction take place in the classroom. In the manner, the ELL student population would begin the initial lesson on a level playing field when compared to the standard population. Similarly ESE student population also struggles with concept attainment and vocabulary mastery that sets them back during the course of the initial lesson in the classroom setting. Preloading students with critical vocabulary and foundational concepts allows students to develop mastery and understanding of the standard on the appropriate level of rigor during the classroom lessons.
Intended Outcome	Students engaged in pre-instructional interventions will develop the foundational skill and understand key vocabulary before initial lessons in the classrooms. Student classroom accommodations will shift to developing student mastery on the rigor of the standard. Pre-instructional interventions of both ELL and ESE students will decrease the achievement gaps of both groups by a minimum on three percentage points. Achievement gaps decreases will be evident on both grade level content area common assessments and state mandated year end assessments.
Point Person	Kevin Flanagan (kevin.flanagan@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students displaying learning gaps when compared to general population. Students in targeted subgroups will be identified based on several criteria: Students have limited language proficiency or students are identified as ESE. Students are not currently enrolled in a block reading program. Students are not currently performing on grade level (if prior year scores are available) Students are identified by teachers as needing pre-instructional interventions (if prior years scores are not available. Students groups will be limited to 20 ELL and 15 ESE per grade level. 2. Pre-instructional intervention will be held on Saturday. Classes will be facilitated by ELL and ESE certified teachers supported by paras when appropriate. Pre-instructional intervention teachers will collect critical vocabulary and foundational concepts from content area teachers with regards to upcoming lessons. Saturday interventions will focus on student mastery of the vocabulary and understanding of foundational concepts required to develop the skills on the rigor of the standards. Pre-tests and student activities will develop the background knowledge and cultivate student engagement before lessons are taught in the classroom. Students will rotate through direction instruction, collaborative learning groups, and technology bases assignments during the course of the Saturday intervention. Teachers will assess students mastery of the presented material and share information with

classroom teachers.

3. Teachers of identified students will receive professional development in culturally responsive instruction in partnership with the district Minority Achievement Office. Teachers will be monitored for appropriate implementation of culturally responsive instruction. Additional professional development sessions will be provided for teachers not demonstrating effective implementation of the strategies in the classroom setting as determined by common assessment achievement gap data and leadership team observations.

Person Responsible   Kevin Flanagan (kevin.flanagan@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

1. Learning gaps for students in the pre-instructional interventions will be monitored by administration and leadership team. Data meetings will be conducted with PLC groups three times per nine week to review student mastery scores for standards as demonstrated through the PLC common assessments. Learning gaps for pre-instructional intervention students will be compared to ELL and ESE students achievement gaps for those students not enrolled in the program. Teacher surveys will be conducted to determine if the pre-instructional interventions increase student mastery and participation in the classroom lesson setting.

In additional to common assessment data analysis, student end of year state test scores will be examined to determine if general population and subgroup achievement gaps have been lowered for students in the pre-instructional intervention program. Students gaps are expected to be lowered by a minimum of three percentage points for those enrolled in the program.

2. Teachers will be monitored for effective implementation of culturally responsive instruction through the coaching cycle and both formal and informal observations conducted by members of the leadership team. Data meetings will be conducted to monitor student achievement levels and any relevant learning gaps as demonstrated in common assessment data.

Person Responsible   Kevin Flanagan (kevin.flanagan@ocps.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

By June 2019, at least 90% of the parents at Hunter's Creek Middle School will participate in at least one school event. To ensure that Hunter's Creek Middle School will accomplish this, we will continue to hold numerous membership drives to assist parents in registering with PTSA and SAC to increase parental involvement. We also communicate our efforts via a weekly newsletter called "The Principal's Page" that

is delivered electronically to families, weekly Connect Orange messages, Facebook posts, Twitter posts, and our school Website which is updated with the latest information from our school.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Counselors create and run student centered groups relative to needs identified by student surveys. Such groups include but are not limited to: divorced parent, self-esteem, anger management, time management, dealing with stress, and making new friends. Students with special needs are assigned a support facilitation teacher with whom they coordinate on daily skills such as time management, study skills, peer interaction, and appropriate classroom behavior. Study skills classes are provided to these students to cultivate effective strategies for educational success. Academically struggling students are assigned faculty mentors to review educational progress, discuss personal concerns, provide support and feedback, and provide positive reinforcement to students. All students have data chats in core curriculum classes which include goal setting, identifying obstacles, designing intervention strategies and reviewing progress on a regular basis.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Throughout the year subject area teachers across feeder patterns meet to align needs of students for the next level. Guidance counselors from feeder patterns meet to discuss student needs for transition periods.
Administrators meet with feeder pattern administrators once a month to ensure smooth transitions across the feeder pattern. Guidance counselors and administrators visit feeder pattern schools to present opportunities and welcome students to transition school. Guidance counselors meet one on one with incoming students to discuss scheduling. Elementary students and families are invited to the middle school campus to experience a tour and meet key stake holders. Parents and students are invited to attend Magnet Open House, Spring Open House, and New Student Orientation.

The high school sends representatives to meet with interest groups throughout the year. The community is invited to attend a community event hosted at a high school football game. The high school welcomes parents and students with an orientation in the fall. High school guidance counselors visit students at Hunter's Creek MS to design schedules and answer questions.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

We have implemented a 3-tiered intervention process model that allows different team members to push-in or pull-out for interventions based on the students' areas of need. Instructional coaches provide co-teaching opportunities and lesson modeling for teachers. Teachers notify the MTSS leadership team when they feel a student is in need of additional interventions. Those team members called upon then conference with the classroom teacher and develop a tailored plan of intervention. HCMS will also serve as an MTSS pilot school for the 2018-2019 school year with additional professional development and district resources/support for the MTSS process.

Professional development opportunities will be provided including needs based instructional practice

training, online courses relative to digital curriculum, and attendance fees for professional development related to integration of technology in the classroom. Supplemental Academic Instruction funding will be used to pay teachers for after school tutoring program. Certified teachers will be scheduled to assist students five days a week after school Teachers from each subject area will provide small group and one on one instruction to students to increase mastery in core content areas. Title III funds will be used to pay for teacher training related to effective implementation of ELL strategies in the classroom and annual ELL Conference.

An inventory of resources is maintained through Canvas, Google shared drives, and school-based Share Point sites. Allison Nicosia, Instructional Coach, is responsible for ensuring that resources are maintained and updated as needed.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Guidance counselors meet individually with students during student choice session for future courses. All eighth graders are encouraged to participate in the Digital Information Technology and/or Project Lead the Way course.