
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 8/26/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2019-20 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%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hidden Oaks Middle School

2801 SW MARTIN HWY, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/homs

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>21%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>23%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	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	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 within our performance data.
Elliott, Trisha	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will mirror efforts to monitor instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders. Student data will be the focus of all problem solving and action planning conversations.
Hendricks, Greg	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. The role of Assistant Principal is to support a hospitable school climate that is safe, cooperative and collaborative to all students, staff, and families. The role also calls for identifying and cultivating instructional leadership opportunities among staff members. Multiplying leadership roles within instructional staff will enable teachers to learn and teach at their best.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/26/2020, 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.*

55

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2019-20 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%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	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	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

Prior Year - 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	324	336	372	0	0	0	0	1032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	32	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	11	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	35	0	0	0	0	105

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	7	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	324	336	372	0	0	0	0	1032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	32	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	11	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	35	0	0	0	0	105

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	7	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	62%	54%	76%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	54%	64%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	47%	50%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	88%	74%	58%	79%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	81%	68%	57%	71%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	55%	51%	49%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	78%	64%	51%	66%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	87%	72%	87%	75%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	2019	72%	57%	15%	54%	18%
	2018	78%	56%	22%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	53%	21%	52%	22%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	51%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	80%	62%	18%	56%	24%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	81%	64%	17%	55%	26%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	78%	60%	18%	54%	24%
	2018	81%	65%	16%	54%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	90%	67%	23%	46%	44%
	2018	81%	66%	15%	45%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	78%	58%	20%	48%	30%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	50%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	77%	-77%	71%	-71%
2018	90%	79%	11%	71%	19%
Compare		-90%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	75%	24%	61%	38%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	70%	30%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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						
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		
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	33	38	32	38	50	35	27	55	14		
ASN	96	79		96	88			100	90		
BLK	45	53		40	53	27					
HSP	69	56	47	72	63	42	56	79	69		
MUL	77	55		86	85						
WHT	77	65	52	80	71	51	69	88	52		
FRL	61	55	47	64	63	42	51	80	42		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	61
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	87
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	58
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	73
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	76
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	72
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	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA L25 Learning Gains have been the area of lowest performance. This data component has shown an upward trend for the past three years, but it remains the lowest area.

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

ELA Learning Gains for all students dropped three percentage points from 2018 to 2019. The data may reflect the fact that a new grade level entered the cohort resulting in a slight change. However, it is more likely that the need for improved use of differentiated instructional practices exists within ELA classes.

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

Hidden Oaks outperformed the state in all areas. ELA achievement saw a small decrease in performance while the state saw a slight increase in performance during the same year.

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

Science achievement increased three percentage points from 2018-2019. An increase in the use of interactive lab assignments has resulted in increased application of abstract concepts.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

EWS data reveals that the performance of students with disabilities is disproportionately low compared to non-disabled peers on one or more state assessments.

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

1. Improve ELA learning gains overall
2. Maintain an upward trend in ELA learning gains among students performing in the bottom quartile.
3. Improve Civics EOC outcomes.
4. Improve differentiated instructional practices to meet the varied needs of all learners across content areas.
5. Improve the performance of students with disabilities in reading and math courses.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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)

Measurable Outcome: Improve the implementation of the PLC cycle to focus instruction, increase the use of research based instructional strategies and resources. Evidence of the improvement will be shown through increased Learning Gains in ELA and math respectively. Each will increase five percentage points, ELA 54%-59% and Math 68%-73%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use data to plan and deliver daily instruction that is focused on state standards, engaging, and differentiated to meet the needs of all learners. Particular attention will be paid to students who need specific interventions to succeed and students who need enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation ensures that students are given multiple options to take in information. 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 (teachers and administration) 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 Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Provide on-going professional development to teachers based on data collected during our learning walks, student performance data, and PLC artifacts.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA goals are established to ensure all that students have an equitable opportunity to achieve academic success. Historic data shows that students with disabilities have typically performed less well relative to their peers at Hidden Oaks.

Measurable Outcome: Improve learning outcomes for students with the greatest learning needs. Evidence of this will be shown through increased performance of students in the lowest quartile in reading by five percentage points from 54%-59%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will develop and implement specifically designed interventions to meet student needs relative to the standards. Teacher and student mentoring will also be put in place to help build self-awareness, to foster independent progress monitoring and raise achievement among students performing in the lowest quartile in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has consistently shown that response to specifically designed interventions 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.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Students performing in our bottom quartile will be paired with a mentor to track their progress across classes.

Mentors will provide an additional layer of coaching and support to help develop non-academic skills that may be needed to foster academic and social/emotional success such as executive functioning.

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

Grade level team leaders will partner with teachers and mentors to foster effective communication with the family to ensure a comprehensive approach to student success.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Professional learning communities serve two 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.

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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use short cycle 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 one curriculum, instruction, and assessment facilitator (CIAF) per content area 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 (short cycle) to the CIAF team
- Admin will provide training and coaching in best leadership and facilitation practices to the CIAFs and other team leaders.
- Admin will provide training in the theory and best practices of the PLC process to all instructional staff.
- CIAFs will lead bi-weekly PLC gatherings that follow the teaching and learning cycle.
- Administrators will attend PLC gatherings 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 Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will monitor student performance on CQA and unit assessments in Civics. Use of the the teaching and learning cycle was applied during the last school year when content gaps were presented. We will continue to focus on this area throughout this year to ensure that all students are benefiting from our instructional practices.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Every member of our school community is valued and supported. We work to ensure that they experience a positive, safe, and effective academic experience at Hidden Oaks Middle School. Our stakeholders are 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.

Our School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Association are 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 success among all students. Action is quickly taken to address needs that are evidenced.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$2,500.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
1000	510-Supplies	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,500.00	
<i>Notes: Purchase materials to support differentiated instruction.</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$2,500.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
1000	510-Supplies	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,500.00	
<i>Notes: Materials and supplies to support alternate learning opportunities for students with disabilities.</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$3,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
1000	310-Professional and Technical Services	0321 - Hidden Oaks Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00	
<i>Notes: Professional Development in the effective implementation of the PLC process</i>						
Total:					\$8,000.00	