Martin County School District

Hidden Oaks Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hidden Oaks Middle School

2801 SW MARTIN HWY, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/homs

Demographics

Principal: Trisha Elliott

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2020-21 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	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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	

* 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 Martin 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

Hidden Oaks Middle School

2801 SW MARTIN HWY, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/homs

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	22%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

The mission of the Martin County School District, in partnership with family and community, is to Educate All Students for Success. Hidden Oaks Middle School is committed to providing a safe and challenging learning environment which will empower all students to achieve their utmost potential. The Hidden Oaks Middle School team, along with the shared involvement of students, parents, and community promotes the principles that assist in preparing our children to be life-long learners and contributing members of our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hidden Oaks Middle School envisions empowered students who achieve their utmost potential, who are prepared to be life-long learners and who become contributing members of our global society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Christopher	Principal	Facilitate the implementation of the school-wide instructional program as indicated within the School improvement Plan. This includes monitoring instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to students, staff, and families; and taking action to address areas of weakness evidenced withhttps://www.floridacims.org/plans/47275/edit/35005#abody1in our performance data.
Elliott, Trisha	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal-Curriculum is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will include monitoring instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders; and leading professional learning. Student data will be the focus of all problem solving and action planning conversations.
Hendricks, Greg	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal-Discipline is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will include monitoring student safety and engagement in learning; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders; and ensuring a learning environment that supports effective learning for all. Student data will be the focus of all problem solving and action planning conversations.
Ciufo, Patience	Instructional Media	As media specialist, ultimately I am able to provide both the physical and metaphorical space on campus where the love of reading and the effective use of ideas and information by both students and teachers are fostered daily. As the former Literacy Coach, current Cambridge Coordinator and Media Specialist, I am also an instructional partner as I facilitate best-practices professional development and intentional opportunities for teacher collaboration via designing learning experiences that enhance student achievement for all Hidden Oaks students, meeting each student at his/her level to elevate them to their individual potential. On a more micro level, I am also able to provide direct support to ELA, Science and Social Studies' LAFS & B.E.S.T. (ELA) and NGSS (Science and Social Studies) standards with a variety of literary and informational materials that facilitate the opportunities for application and inquiry-based extended research for curricular concepts learned in the core content areas.
Hutchinson, Dawne	Teacher, K-12	The role of the curriculum team leader is to support the mission and vision outlined in the school improvement plan. My support will include collaborating with teachers to develop best practices to increase student achievement with a focus on the four critical questions 1. What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. How will we know they are learning? 3. How will we respond when they aren't learning? 4. How will we respond when they already learned it?

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buddin, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	The role of the curriculum team leader is to support the mission and vision outlined in the school improvement plan. My support will include collaborating with teachers to develop best practices to increase student achievement with a focus on the four critical questions 1. What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. How will we know they are learning? 3. How will we respond when they aren't learning? 4. How will we respond when they already learned it?
Ely, Marie	Teacher, K-12	The role of the curriculum team leader is to support the mission and vision outlined in the school improvement plan. My support will include collaborating with teachers to develop best practices to increase student achievement with a focus on the four critical questions 1. What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. How will we know they are learning? 3. How will we respond when they aren't learning? 4. How will we respond when they already learned it?
Koeppel, Amy	Teacher, K-12	The role of the curriculum team leader is to support the mission and vision outlined in the school improvement plan. My support will include collaborating with teachers to develop best practices to increase student achievement with a focus on the four critical questions 1. What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. How will we know they are learning? 3. How will we respond when they aren't learning? 4. How will we respond when they already learned it?

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 12/1/2019, Trisha Elliott

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
12

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
33

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
58

Total number of students enrolled at the school
945

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	304	336	338	0	0	0	0	978
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	18	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	14	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	21	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	36	42	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	33	19	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	304	322	0	0	0	0	908
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	25	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	66

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	13	8	15	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	304	322	0	0	0	0	908
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	25	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	66

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	13	8	15	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				76%	62%	54%	79%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	58%	54%	67%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	51%	47%	54%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				88%	74%	58%	85%	73%	58%
Math Learning Gains				81%	68%	57%	78%	70%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	55%	51%	67%	57%	51%
Science Achievement				78%	64%	51%	73%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement					87%	72%	91%	82%	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	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	74%	53%	21%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison	-72%					
08	2021					
	2019	80%	62%	18%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison	-74%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	78%	60%	18%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2021					
	2019	90%	67%	23%	46%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	78%	58%	20%	48%	30%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	77%	-77%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	75%	24%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Reading and Math data were based off 2020-2021 APM1 and APM2 data . There were no winter assessments, so the chart remains blank in these areas.
Civics and Science data for grade 8 were gathered from student outcomes on 2020-2021 Civics/Science 08 Common Quarterly Assessments CQA1, CQA2, and CQA3.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59.19		64.73
	Economically Disadvantaged	45.71		49.17
	Students With Disabilities	48.94		57.34
	English Language Learners	34.78		50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.97		62.46
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.34		43.15
	Students With Disabilities	47.58		49.17
	English Language Learners	52.17		47.83

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.55		63.76
	Economically Disadvantaged	45.86		48.92
	Students With Disabilities	46.53		55.1
	English Language Learners	30.43		44.44
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.99		61.69
	Economically Disadvantaged	32		44
	Students With Disabilities	46.83		46.83
	English Language Learners	50		43.48
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59.11	63.41	65.52
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	48.08	45.1
	Students With Disabilities	26.83	29.27	41.46
	English Language Learners	40	60	80

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61.62		66.78
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.24		57.72
	Students With Disabilities	40		49.46
	English Language Learners	22.22		50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48.92		54.97
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.08		45.78
	Students With Disabilities	35.62		36.23
	English Language Learners	60		11.11
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51.48	55.7	52.65
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.79	42.86	38.3
	Students With Disabilities	20	26.83	21.05
	English Language Learners	33.33	20	16.67

Subgroup Data Review

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	32	42	38	47	61	47	34	75			
ELL	54	77	64	62	69	60					
ASN	76	78		92	78				80		
BLK	33	28	18	29	35	18					
HSP	68	63	56	77	72	64	74	94	65		
MUL	72	77		88	91						
WHT	72	62	48	83	71	56	70	91	74		
FRL	54	51	48	63	57	48	55	80	69		
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	42	55	49	54	65	57	40		22		
ELL	58	57		75	53						

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
ASN	88	64		100	75		100		93		
BLK	47	67		56	67	55					
HSP	74	62	55	82	83	74	80		72		
MUL	76	60		86	80		80				
WHT	76	62	55	89	81	66	77		68		
FRL	57	57	47	75	76	67	64		47		

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	41	48	36	58	69	63	32	72	22		
ELL	54	77		69	80						
ASN	94	72		100	86		100	100	93		
BLK	57	57	50	55	70	62	45				
HSP	75	64	51	77	74	57	64	89	53		
MUL	89	69		86	77		100		92		
WHT	79	67	55	87	78	70	73	91	62		
FRL	62	57	43	72	70	65	52	77	47		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	684
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

A dip in student performance was noted across content areas and subgroups, however our overall percent of points possible remained near the average of scores for the preceding four school years. Students who are African American, who are eligible to receive free or reduced lunch, and those students who have identified disabilities were less successful than peers in other subgroups. Our discipline data showed a decrease in referrals and our student satisfaction surveys were generally positive suggesting improved climate on campus as well.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA L25 learning gains have historically been the area of lowest performance. This year we saw reduced levels of success among our students in the bottom quartile for math and in the science proficiency rates as well.

Achievement gaps are noted between the performance of our students who are English language learners and native speakers of English; between students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; and those who are not. However, our students who are African-American and those students who are identified as having a learning disability performed the least well of all subgroups.

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

We believe that inconsistencies that existed between in-person and remote learning contributed to decreased levels of success for students in general. The limited opportunity for differentiated learning support was particularly felt by students who have reduced access to extra help at home.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our Civics score remained consistent with prior years' scores, and our acceleration points were the highest that they have been in the last five years.

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

Use of formative data to drive instruction was stronger in Social Studies than other content areas. Elements of the teaching and learning cycle were also more well-developed in Algebra and Geometry.

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

We will continue to to improve our students' learning experience by engaging fully in the PLC process as a school community. We will work to improve teacher collaboration in instructional design/ implementation through training and support (collective teacher efficacy). We will continue to use formative assessments for data collection to use for instructional planning (response to intervention). We will establish and maintain positive relationships with students that foster high expectations and a safe learning environment; and inspire high levels of engagement (teacher estimates of student achievement). We will also continue to develop our work through the Cambridge Program to enrich the learning of all students.
MCSD Success Plan Connections: Employee Success (Goals 2 & 4), Student Success (Goals 1 & 3), Culture of Collaboration (Goal 4)

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.

Training on-site: Visible Learning and High Effect Strategies (August); The PLC Process: Actions and Expectations for Success at HOMS (August); Cambridge Learner Attributes and Curriculum Development/Instructional Planning (September, October, November). Training Off Site: The Summit on PLC at Works (February); Starting a Movement: Building Culture From the Inside Out in Your PLC Workshop (April)
MCSD Success Plan Connections: Employee Success (Goals 2 & 4), Student Success (Goals 1 & 3)

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

Our school improvement goals were refocused during the 2020-21 school year and will continue to be developed and refined for years to come. We will continue to improve upon our PLC processes through on-going professional development of our teacher leaders and improved use of the teaching and learning cycle to increase our levels of student success. This will include additional use of common formative assessments, lesson study, and action research. MCSD Success Plan Connections: Employee Success (Goals 2 & 4), Student Success (Goals 1 & 3), Culture of Collaboration (Goal 4)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA L25 learning gains have historically been the area of lowest performance at HOMS. An achievement gap was noted in 2021 FSA data between the performance of our students who are English language learners and native speakers of English; between students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch and those who are not. However, our students who are African-American and those students who are identified as having a disability performed the least well of all subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2022 school year. In order to ensure all students receive individualized attention, our outcomes will be measured in a variety of ways. Our goal for the overall proficiency rate is to increase five percentage points from 72% to 77%, We will work to ensure that the the percent of students who demonstrate learning gains will improve by five percentage points from 62% to 67%. The percent of students performing in our bottom quartile will improve from 48% to 53% Students with disabilities will improve more than five percentage points in an effort to close the achievement gap. We will work to achieve an improvement of eight percentage points from 33% to 41%. African American students will improve more than five percentage points in effort to close the achievement gap from 29% to 34%.
Monitoring:	Teachers will engage in the effective use of the PLC process to improve learning outcomes for all students. Evidence of effective use of the process will include use of common formative assessments (monthly or more per content area), weekly collaborative planning meeting notes and lesson plans, and consistent instructional practices across like-classrooms. Curriculum Based Unit Assessments and State Based Adaptive Progress Monitoring Data will also be tracked and used to monitor progress and drive instructional planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use formative assessments to drive their instructional decision-making as a part of the larger PLC cycle.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increases in student performance have been linked to schools where there was a shared vision of leadership, where each member of the teaching-learning community contributed, and where teachers collectively planned activities and then reflected together upon completion. (Dufour, 1998) Collective teacher efficacy has been shown to have the greatest impact on student achievement. (Hattie, 2009)

Action Steps to Implement

Admin will identify a curriculum, instruction, and assessment facilitator (Teacher-Content Leader) to facilitate the PLC process weekly throughout the school year.
Admin will provide training on the professional learning community cycle and on common formative assessments to the content team
Admin will provide training and coaching in best leadership and facilitation practices to the content leaders and other team leaders.
Admin will provide training in the theory and best practices of the PLC process to all instructional staff.
Teacher-Content Leader will lead bi-weekly PLC discussions that follow the teaching and learning cycle.
Administrators will attend PLC discussions weekly to participate in the work
Administrators will visit classrooms to monitor for implementation of the lessons and assessments developed in PLC gatherings.

Person Responsible   Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will:
Engage fully in the PLC process by bringing data, collaborating in the assessment and planning process, and providing consistently effective instruction to ensure the academic success of all learners.

Person Responsible   Amy Koeppel (koeppea@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A discrepancy has been noted between our students' ability to maintain high levels of proficiency and the growth that they should be making each year. This year will will work to improve our learning gains for all, our learning gains for students performing in our lowest quartile, and we will work to ensure that proficiency rates also improve for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2022 school year. We will work to ensure that the the percent of students who demonstrate learning gains will improve by five percentage points from 71% to 76% while the percent of students performing in our bottom quartile will improve from 57% to 62% Students with disabilities will improve more than five percentage points in effort to close the achievement gap. We seek an improvement of eight percentage points in proficiency from 47% to 52%. African American students will improve more than five percentage points in effort to close the achievement gap from from 29% to 34%. Our goal for the overall proficiency rate is to increase by five percentage points from 84% to 89%
Monitoring:	Teachers will engage in effective use of the PLC process to monitor student progress and reteach essential standards to ensure successful outcomes for all learners. Evidence of effective use of the process will include common formative assessment data (monthly or more per content area), weekly collaborative planning meeting notes and lesson plans (that include intentionally planned small groups that ensure standard mastery), and consistent instructional practices across like-classrooms. Common Quarterly Assessments and State Based Adaptive Progress Monitoring Data will also be tracked and used to monitor progress and drive instructional planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marie Ely (elym@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning takes place most effectively in classrooms where knowledge is clearly and powerfully organized, students are highly active in the learning process, assessments are rich and varied, and students feel a sense of safety and connection. (National Research Council, 1990; Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) Teachers will use the teaching and learning cycle described through the PLC model. This cycle is intended to ensure that all learners can and will be successful. The teachers will start with instruction of the standards, move to assessment of student learning, then re-teach concepts that were not mastered to small groups/individuals. Research has consistently shown that response to specifically designed instruction/intervention and teacher estimates of potential student achievement have a strong impact on student learning. Hattie (2009) has noted these two strategies among the strongest influences on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction that is implemented in response to student data that is designed to build on prior learning and occurs through student collaboration ensures that learners are able to demonstrate mastery of content. Differentiating instruction means that you observe and understand the differences and similarities among students and use this information to plan effective instruction and learning for all. (Tomlinson, C. 1999).
Action Steps to Implement	

The leadership team will establish and define teacher and student actions to look for during classroom "learning walk" visits that will provide evidence of instructional differentiation in classrooms.

Person Responsible Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

The leadership team will conduct classroom "learning walk" visits at least monthly to "look for" the evidence of differentiated instruction. Data gathered during these observations will be used to drive professional learning for our teachers.

Person Responsible Marie Ely (elym@martinschools.org)

Admin will identify a curriculum, instruction, and assessment facilitator (Teacher-Content Leader) to facilitate the PLC process weekly throughout the school year.
Admin will provide training on the professional learning community cycle and on common formative assessments to the content team
Admin will provide training and coaching in best leadership and facilitation practices to the content leaders and other team leaders.
Admin will provide training in the theory and best practices of the PLC process to all instructional staff.
Teacher-Content Leader will lead bi-weekly PLC discussions that follow the teaching and learning cycle.
Administrators will attend PLC discussions weekly to participate in the work
Administrators will visit classrooms to monitor for implementation of the lessons and assessments developed in PLC gatherings.

Person Responsible Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

Students performing in our bottom quartile will be prioritized by the MTSS and ESE teams (based on historic and current data) for additional instructional support and intervention within and outside core classes.

Person Responsible Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency rates in science declined from 78% to 70% between 2019 and 2021. While a focus on content based literacy (vocabulary development) has proven effective in maintaining generally high proficiency rates at Hidden Oaks, evidence of differentiation and inquiry based instruction have been inconsistent across classrooms.
Measurable Outcome:	The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2022 school year. In order to ensure all students receive individualized attention, our outcomes will be measured in a variety of ways. Our goal is for the overall proficiency rate to increase five percentage points from 70% to 75%
Monitoring:	Teachers will engage in effective use of the PLC process to improve learning outcomes for all students. Evidence of effective use of the process will include use of common formative assessments (monthly or more per content area), weekly collaborative planning meeting notes and lesson plans that include intentionally planned small groups, labs, and inquiry based lessons that ensure concept attainment, and consistent instructional practices across like-classrooms. Common Quarterly Assessments and State Based Adaptive Progress Monitoring Data will also be tracked and used for instructional planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Buddin (buddind@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use time during PLC discussions to review formative data and plan instruction that includes opportunities for higher level thinking, application of content, and collaboration. Students will engage with cognitively complex tasks designed by teachers in weekly PLC discussions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cognitively complex tasks demand higher-level thinking skills from students. These skills ultimately lead to the development and testing of hypotheses about knowledge they have acquired in their learning. Tasks such as these require students to make decisions, solve problems, experiment, or investigate which leads to deeper levels of understanding (Marzano & Toth, 2014).

Action Steps to Implement

Admin will identify a curriculum, instruction, and assessment facilitator (Teacher-Content Leader) to facilitate the PLC process weekly throughout the school year.
Admin will provide training on the professional learning community cycle and on common formative assessments to the content team
Admin will provide training and coaching in best leadership and facilitation practices to the content leaders and other team leaders.
Admin will provide training in the theory and best practices of the PLC process to all instructional staff.
Teacher-Content Leader will lead bi-weekly PLC discussions that follow the teaching and learning cycle.
Administrators will attend PLC discussions weekly to participate in the work
Administrators will visit classrooms to monitor for implementation of the lessons and assessments developed in PLC gatherings.

Person Responsible	Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

The leadership team will conduct classroom "learning walk" visits at least monthly to "look for" the evidence of cognitively complex tasks in instruction. Data gathered during these observations will be used to drive professional learning for our teachers.

Person Responsible	Danielle Buddin (buddind@martinschools.org)

The leadership team will establish and define teacher and student actions to look for during classroom "learning walk" visits that will provide evidence of cognitively complex tasks in classrooms.

Person Responsible	Danielle Buddin (buddind@martinschools.org)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Professional learning communities serve many purposes: Improving the skills and knowledge of educators through collaborative study, expertise exchange, and professional dialogue; and improving the educational achievement of students through stronger teaching directly impact student outcomes. The collective teacher efficacy that is fostered through the PLC process also serves to improve staff morale and overall job satisfaction. It is the goal of each content leader on our campus
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will engage in effective use of the PLC process to improve learning outcomes for all students. Evidence in effective use of the process will include use of common formative assessments (monthly or more per content area), weekly collaborative planning meeting note and lesson plans, and consistent instructional practices across like-classrooms.
Monitoring:	Teacher participation in PLC meetings and the implementation of instructional plans will be supported and monitored by administration. The school leadership team will also monitor student data and the teachers' satisfaction with their professional learning and growth offered to them.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional learning will be supported and scaffolded to foster new and more effective skills among teachers and staff. A schedule of recognition of their efforts and successes will occur throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increases in student performance have been linked to schools where there was a shared vision of leadership, where each member of the teaching-learning community contributed, and where teachers collectively planned activities and then reflected together upon completion. (Dufour, 1998) Collective teacher efficacy has been shown to have the greatest impact on student achievement. (Hattie, 2009)

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Hidden Oaks' school community has had a relatively low incidents of behavior that have resulted in disciplinary actions when compared to other middle schools. Of the incidents that we do have, a majority occur in classrooms and are related to disrespect or defiance. We will continue to teach and reteach our campus expectations and follow our PBIS plan. Our current PBIS system structures are consistently reviewed, rewards and reinforcements are consistently offered, and students are responsive to our efforts.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

We value every member of our school community. We work to ensure that they experience a positive, safe, and effective academic experience at Hidden Oaks Middle School. All of our stakeholders play a role in ensuring the success of our students and each group is offered multiple opportunities to participate in the governance of the school. Historical data shows high levels of staff, student, and family participation in the surveys, committees, and on-going dialogues we use to inform our decision-making.

It is as important to recognize success while we work on improving our stakeholders' experience. Recognition of students and staff occur consistently throughout the year. The PBIS model serves as the platform for the activities we deliver to support and recognize students and staff. Families are also encouraged to recognize and support our school throughout the year.

We have established multiple platforms for communication with our families including our school web page, social media sites, mass calling and texting systems, and an App for mobile devices.

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

Our administrative team has set an expectation that all members of our school family promote safety, acceptance, and high expectations at all times. To ensure that all voices are heard and all needs are met, we encourage a climate of shared decision-making among our stakeholders.

Teacher leaders represent our instructional staff by grade level and by content area. These leaders meet

formally with administration every other week and informally between meetings to discuss timely campus issues surrounding academics, logistics, and climate. Student leaders represent our student stakeholders and work to ensure a positive school climate as well. Students leaders from National Junior Honor Society and Student Council meet every other week to engage in positive school-wide promotions, advocate for student needs, and support a variety of issues. Student leaders also frequently meet with administration to discuss issues and solve problems that may be present.

Our School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Association are also very active. Student performance data and other sources of information are reviewed regularly throughout the year to monitor student performance. Proactive steps are taken to maintain academic and social-emotional success among all students. Action is quickly taken to address needs that are evidenced.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	330-Travel	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	General Fund		$2,000.00
			Notes: Solution Tree PLC Conference (Summit in Phoenix) for our ELA Content Leader			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	330-Travel	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: PLC Conference (Orlando) Math Content Leader			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	330-Travel	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School			$2,000.00
			Notes: PLC Summit Conference (Phoenix) for our Science Content Leader			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	330-Travel	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	General Fund		$2,000.00
			Notes: Assistant Principal to Solution Tree PLC Summit in Phoenix.			
					Total:	$10,000.00