

Martin County School District

# Hidden Oaks Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Hidden Oaks Middle School

2801 SW MARTIN HWY, Palm City, FL 34990

[martinschools.org/o/homs](http://martinschools.org/o/homs)

## Demographics

**Principal: Trisha Elliott**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2022

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 25%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (65%)<br>2018-19: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (73%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Hidden Oaks Middle School

2801 SW MARTIN HWY, Palm City, FL 34990

[martinschools.org/o/homs](http://martinschools.org/o/homs)

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 25%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 20%  |

### 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 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**

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   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| 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-Curriculum and Assessment 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-Student Services 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' 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. |
| 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?   |
| 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  |



| Name            | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|----------------|---|
|                 |                | 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? |
| Montague, Linda | 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

Tuesday 6/21/2022, Trisha Elliott

**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.*

7

**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.*

30

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

950

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

7

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

6

## 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 | 340 | 308 | 337 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 985   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52  | 54  | 51  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 157   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12  | 34  | 32  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 8   | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 8   | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 38  | 40  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34  | 19  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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 | 33 | 35 | 44 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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 | 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 |       |

**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 | 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     |

**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             | 68%    | 53%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 76%    | 62%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 58%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 33%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 51%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 80%    | 32%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 88%    | 74%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 81%    | 68%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    |          |       |        |          |       | 68%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 67%    | 61%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 78%    | 64%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 90%    | 59%      | 58%   |        |          |       |        | 87%      | 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 | 72%    | 57%      | 15%                        | 54%   | 18%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 53%      | 21%                        | 52%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -72%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 62%      | 18%                        | 56%   | 24%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -74%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 81%    | 64%      | 17%                        | 55%   | 26%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 60%      | 18%                        | 54%   | 24%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 90%    | 67%      | 23%                        | 46%   | 44%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 78%    | 58%      | 20%                        | 48%   | 30%                     |
| 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        | 0%     | 77%      | -77%                  | 71%   | -71%               |
| 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         | 99%    | 75%      | 24%                   | 61%   | 38%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 100%   | 65%      | 35%                   | 57%   | 43%                |

### 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                                       | 38       | 41     | 34          | 51        | 52      | 45           | 41       | 62      | 67        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 42       | 30     | 23          | 76        | 63      | 73           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 81       | 62     |             | 86        | 81      |              | 73       | 100     | 77        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       | 54     |             | 54        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 64       | 46     | 30          | 80        | 66      | 73           | 65       | 90      | 64        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 75       | 58     |             | 86        | 71      |              | 87       | 100     | 83        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 52     | 34          | 80        | 65      | 51           | 66       | 89      | 74        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 52       | 43     | 27          | 65        | 58      | 48           | 55       | 81      | 55        |                   |                     |
| 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      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 65  |
| 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                                       | 584 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 51  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 80  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 56  |
| 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  | 64  |
| 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   | 80  |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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                                | 54  |
| 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?

A dip in student performance was noted across content areas and subgroups, resulting in a dip in our overall score when compared to the preceding four school years. Students who are eligible to receive free or reduced lunch, English Language Learners, and those students who have identified disabilities were less successful than peers in other subgroups.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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.

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

An implementation dip was expected in association with a new ELA curriculum this year. However, long term data indicates a pattern over time. Differentiating instruction for students to ensure success for all is on-going work across content areas at our school. We will continue to strengthen our PLCs as an integral part of igniting and sustaining change in instruction/student achievement.

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

Our civics, algebra, and geometry scores remained consistent with prior years' scores, and our acceleration points continued to increase this year. Students who are African American increased proficiency and learning gains across content areas, and student with disabilities improved ELA, math, and science proficiency.

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

Use of formative data and collaborative planning continues to be strong in Social Studies. Elements of the teaching and learning cycle continued to develop in Algebra and Geometry. Awareness of data trends within subgroups increased this year.

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

We will continue 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 continue to 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:

The PLC Process: Updated Actions and Expectations for Success at HOMS (August); Cambridge Learner Attributes and Curriculum. Development/Instructional Planning in Math, ELA and Science. (September, October, November).

Training Off Site: Cambridge school visit and teacher training, additional staff to attend the Summit on PLC at Works (dates TBA);

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.**

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)

### **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 ELA****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:  
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

ELA L25 learning gains have historically been the area of lowest performance at HOMS. An achievement gap was noted in 2022 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 identified as having a disability performed the least well of all subgroups.

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

The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2023 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 nine percentage points from 68% to 77%. Students with disabilities made gains from 21 to 22, however we will work to continue to improve their learning progress in an effort to close the achievement gap. We will work to achieve an improvement of five percentage points in proficiency from 38% to 43%. African American students also made gains from 21 to 22. We will continue to work to improve proficiency rates more than five percentage points in effort to close the achievement gap from 57% to 64%.

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

Teachers will continue to grow in their 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 Progress Monitoring Data will also be tracked and used to monitor progress and drive instructional planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Trisha Elliott (elliott1@martinschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented**

Teachers will use formative assessments to drive their instructional decision-making as a part of the larger PLC cycle. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction based on data to meet the needs of students who struggle to achieve mastery on essential standards. We will also use Cambridge and Gifted standards to enrich the learning experience of students who have already demonstrated mastery and to support students who benefit from alternate learning experiences.

**for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the  
rationale for  
selecting  
this specific  
strategy.**

**Describe the  
resources/  
criteria used  
for selecting  
this 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**

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.

Our Teacher-Content Leader will continue to facilitate the PLC process weekly throughout the school year. Admin will provide support and added training on the professional learning community cycle and on common formative assessments to the content team. Admin will continue to support our Content Lead in leadership and facilitation practices. Admin will provide training, guidance and assistance in the theory and best practices of the PLC process to all instructional staff. The 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** Amy Koeppel (koeppea@martinschools.org)

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**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>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. Although learning gains will not be calculated during this year's baseline data collection resulting from a new state assessment, we will continue to work to improve our learning growth for all, especially our students performing in our lowest quartile. We will also work to ensure that proficiency rates maintain or improve for all students as teachers and students implement a new curriculum for math this year.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>                | <p>The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2023 school year. We will work to ensure that differentiated learning opportunities exist for all students. We will work to ensure that this is demonstrated by an overall proficiency rate increase by five percentage points from 80% to 89%.</p>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <p>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), 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 Progress Monitoring Data will also be tracked and used to monitor progress and drive instructional planning.</p>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy being</b>   | <p>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 reteach concepts that were not mastered to small groups/individuals. Research has consistently shown that response to specifically</p> |

**implemented for this Area of Focus.** 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:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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).

**Describe the resources/criteria 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.

The leadership team will visit classrooms for "learning walks" that will provide evidence of instructional differentiation in classrooms. A MCSD lookfor tool will be used to collect the data.

**Person Responsible** Marie Ely (elym@martinschools.org)

The teacher-Content Leader will 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 guidance and support in best leadership and facilitation practices to the content leader 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)

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)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Proficiency rates in science declined from 70% to 67% between 2021 and 2022. 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:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The success of all HOMS students remains a priority in the 2023 school year. In order to ensure all students receive individualized attention, our outcomes will be measured in a variety of ways. Our goal is to improve our science proficiency rate from 67% to 75%.

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

Teachers will continue to 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 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:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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. We will also use Cambridge and Gifted standards to enrich the learning experience of students who have already demonstrated mastery and to support students who benefit from alternate learning experiences.

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

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).

**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.

Our content leader will continue to facilitate the PLC process weekly throughout the school year. Admin will provide training and support on the professional learning community cycle and on common formative assessments. 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 team work.

**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 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)



**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to continue stakeholder satisfaction****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

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

Our survey results indicated that teacher and student stakeholder groups are seeking improvements in our consistent implementation and recognition of school-wide expectations.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We are working to improve our stakeholders' perceptions of equity, opportunity, and fairness on campus. We are seeking an increase in positive behavior and reduction of maladaptive behaviors (evidenced through referrals) by 10% as compared to last school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will be monitoring student participation in the Positive Behavior Intervention Support process through student participation counts in PBIS events and through a reduction in school-wide referral rates. We expect to see an improvement of five percent in the number of stakeholders who agree or strongly agree across our school survey items.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Greg Hendricks (hendrig@martinschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Re-invigoration of the PBIS process school-wide.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PBIS is a nationally recognized process through which members of a school community develop, establish, refine and reinforce shared expectations for behavior on a campus. When implemented effectively, PBIS has proven successful at shifting school culture and climate.

**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.

Create a paid (stipend) PBIS lead position for the school.

Create/implement consistent, engaging, and predictable reinforcement opportunities

Reteach and reinforce our school-wide PBIS expectations

Monitor effectiveness of PBIS through interest in reinforcers

Survey students and offer additional opportunities for reinforcement when needed

**Person Responsible**

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

Data has shown that high frequency low intensity behaviors have been a chronic issue impacting school climate over time. To address this we will create a paid (stipend) Single School Culture Coordinator to support common expectations regarding school rules and facilitate opportunities to reteach school rules when needed, and refer students for added support when needed.

**Person Responsible**

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

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

NA

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

NA

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step****Person Responsible for Monitoring**

NA

**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.**

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 school culture and environment.**

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.