

Orange County Public Schools

Hunters Creek Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hunters Creek Middle

13400 TOWN LOOP BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Joumana Moukaddam

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hunters Creek Middle

13400 TOWN LOOP BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">54%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">82%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moukaddam, Joumana	Principal	
Schrimsher , Rachel	Assistant Principal	
Sims, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Carter, Joquetta	Dean	
Golia, Dominic	Dean	
Dominguez Lozada, Elyse	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Armstrong, Kelly	School Counselor	
Merritt, Annikki	School Counselor	
Shah, Sejal	School Counselor	
Godwin, Karen	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/28/2018, Joumana Moukaddam

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,220

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

13

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

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	398	371	386	0	0	0	0	1155
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	83	89	0	0	0	0	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	13	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	72	96	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	42	72	0	0	0	0	203
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	108	107	0	0	0	0	327

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	50	79	0	0	0	0	202

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/28/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	371	367	396	0	0	0	0	1134
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	25	31	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	39	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	30	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	42	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	52	71	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	49	57	0	0	0	0	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	79	0	0	0	0	146

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	371	367	396	0	0	0	0	1134
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	25	31	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	39	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	30	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	42	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	52	71	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	49	57	0	0	0	0	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	79	0	0	0	0	146

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	49%	50%				66%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						64%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						60%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	74%	36%	36%				81%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	77%						79%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%						76%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	55%	53%				67%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	61%	58%				75%	67%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	53%	43%	10%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	75%	49%	26%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	36%	38%	46%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	48%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	70%	66%	4%	71%	-1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	63%	34%	61%	36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	53%	43%	57%	39%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	40	40	49	67	71	25	40			
ELL	45	51	41	61	73	77	37	53	69		
ASN	89	76		98	91		89	96	95		
BLK	59	50	64	79	76	80	44	90	64		
HSP	54	53	44	70	75	77	49	66	76		
MUL	71	63		67	65						
WHT	70	55	45	82	82	85	71	89	77		
FRL	55	52	46	69	76	80	54	68	73		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	34	24	28	49	47	15	38			
ELL	41	59	56	56	60	57	42	47	75		

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
ASN	86	79		96	83		86	90	95		
BLK	69	58		63	46	55	68	60	68		
HSP	50	57	50	60	59	56	49	57	77		
MUL	69	92		88	77						
WHT	70	60	56	77	64	48	75	72	83		
FRL	51	55	47	60	59	57	52	53	74		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	36	38	45	54	48	29	29			
ELL	47	60	62	71	78	79	45	61	86		
ASN	82	73	64	93	90	62	84	96	99		
BLK	64	62	36	72	72	75	61	63	90		
HSP	60	62	60	75	77	76	59	68	88		
MUL	78	86		83	81		75		90		
WHT	73	65	63	89	81	80	76	84	88		
FRL	58	62	62	75	77	75	58	69	89		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The Federal Index SWD Subgroup has improved beyond 41% to 44% in 2022. The Federal Index English Language Learner Subgroup has improved beyond 41% to 57% in 2022. The Social Studies Achievement Category (Civics) has improved from 2020-2021(60%) to 2021-2022 (75%).

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

The Science Achievement Category has decreased from 2018-2019 (67%) to 2021-2022 (57%). This area indicates the greatest need for improvement of all achievement areas.

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

The factors that contributed to this decline were the need for structured data monitoring, interventions and testing.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was Math achievement (67% in 2021 to 74% in 2022).

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

Targeted instructional interventions along with individualized differentiated instruction and tutoring opportunities led to this improvement.

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

Providing more structured targeted monitoring of the Multi-Tiered System of Support and optimizing the learning to help students make greater learning gains by creating high expectations, engaging assignments and high parental involvement/communication will accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school are:

- 1) Life Skills Training
- 2) MTSS
- 3) ESE and ESOL Interventions

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

In order to ensure sustainability, we will continue to closely monitor the proficiency of our SWD's across all content areas throughout the year, increase the attendance rate of students by building stronger relationships with our families and decrease the number of students who are suspended.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In reviewing the 2022 School Data and introducing the new B.E.S.T. Standards to our teachers over the summer through District and School Professional Development, there is a need for refining instructional practices to ensure that all instruction is aligned with these standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2023, the ELA FAST data for HCMS will reflect that at least 66% of students are proficient.
By June of 2023, the Math FAST data for HCMS will reflect that at least 81% of students are proficient.

This area of focus will be monitored in the following ways:

Monitoring:

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

- Classroom Visits to monitor instructional practices
- Leadership Team participation in PLC's
- Monitoring iReady Data for students within Intensive Reading Classes
- Monitoring MTSS Data for students who have Reading Interventions
- Analyzing the FAST Data for each testing window

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joumana Moukaddam (joumana.moukaddam@ocps.net)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implement for this Area of Focus:

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

- On-going Professional Development on B.E.S.T Standards
- Coaching and Mentoring New Teachers
- Tiered Interventions
- Increased focus on Literacy including a School-Wide Word of the Day, and efforts to increase Media Center Circulation
- Increased focus on Math including incorporating the Big 15 (6th Grade), Big 20 (7th Grade) and Big 25 (8th Grade) Skills into all Math classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The above mentioned strategies were selected based on the Leadership Team's analysis of our 2022 School Data.

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.

-Ongoing Professional Development on B.E.S.T Standards

Person Responsible

Rachel Schrimsher (rachel.schrimsher@ocps.net)

-Increased focus on Literacy including a School-Wide Word of the Day, and efforts to increase Media Center Circulation

Person Responsible

Rachel Schrimsher (rachel.schrimsher@ocps.net)

-Increased focus on Math including incorporating the Big 15 (6th Grade), Big 20 (7th Grade) and Big 25 (8th Grade) Skills into all Math classes.

Person Responsible

Joumana Moukaddam (joumana.moukaddam@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

While the Students with Disabilities Subgroup exceeded ESSA requirements in 2022 (44%), The HCMS Leadership Team will still closely monitor and support our students with disabilities and their teachers to ensure that they are able to achieve proficiency on the FAST Reading and Math Assessments.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

By June of 2023, at least 50% of students with disabilities at Hunter's Creek Middle School will achieve proficiency on FAST Reading and Math Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in the following ways:

- Classroom Visits to monitor instructional practices
- Leadership Team participation in PLCs
- Monitoring iReady Data for students within Intensive Reading Classes
- Monitoring MTSS Data for students who have Reading Interventions
- Analyzing the FAST Data for each testing window

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The following evidence-based strategies will be implement for this Area of Focus:

- On-going Professional Development on B.E.S.T Standards
- Coaching and Mentoring New Teachers
- Tiered Interventions
- Increased focus on Literacy including a School-Wide Word of the Day, and efforts to increase Media Center Circulation
- Increased focus on Math including incorporating the Big 15 (6th Grade), Big 20 (7th Grade) and Big 25 (8th Grade) Skills into all Math classes.

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

The Leadership Team has decided to use the above mentioned strategies to lend to ensuring that students with disabilities find success (proficiency) in classes as well as on the FAST Assessment. While the Students with Disabilities Subgroup exceeded ESSA requirements in 2022 (44%), the HCMS Leadership Team will still closely monitor and support our students with disabilities and their teachers to ensure that they are able to achieve proficiency on the FAST Reading and Math Assessments.

used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Classroom visits to monitor instructional practices according to the Marzano Framework and Instructional Evaluation Calendar

Person Responsible Nicole Sims (nicole.sims@ocps.net)

Monitor instructional practices and student performance in Learning Strategies and Support Facilitation Classes.

Person Responsible Rachel Schrimsher (rachel.schrimsher@ocps.net)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use of life skills learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

1) Joumana Moukaddam, Rachel Schrimsher and Nicole Sims consistently meet with the teachers and PLC's to

- provide support, listen to concerns and offer guidance; Introducing and implementing HERO System
- 2) Life Skills School Team: Kellee Moye, Shannon Rokaw, Linda Rasmussen, Kayla Enion, Alejandra Camacho, Sejal Shah and Joumana Moukaddam, plan and implement Life Skills PD's and activities on campus. (Move into intentionally implementing Life Skills strategies as a daily routine)
 - 3) Alejandra Camacho - Counseling groups, Character Lab and helping with SAFE
 - 4) Diane LaRouche - Goes into Learning Strategies classes and does Wellness Wednesdays on the Eagle Eye News
 - 5) All Departments - Plan Family nights! (1 per quarter: Literacy, STEM, SEL, Arts)
 - 6) Annikki Merritt - Kindness Club
 - 7) PE Teachers - Weekly Mental Health lessons
 - 8) Diane LaRouche - Manage Zen Room, and offers Staff Yoga Classes
 - 9) Sejal Shah and Laura Hermida - Teacher Self Care and Wellness
 - 10) Karen Godwin - School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS)
 - 11) Leadership Team and Life Skills Team - Introducing House System