Oak Hammock Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Oak Hammock Middle School

5321 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://ohm.leeschools.net//

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Oak Hammock Middle School is committed to providing an academically focused environment through arts integration and globally minded challenges, empowering each student to reach his or her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak Hammock Middle School envisions a collaborative multicultural community that values lifelong learning and provides the tools necessary to succeed in a global economy.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Howdyshell, David	Principal	Staff management, mission and vision of the school, instructional leader
Falk, Carl	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and instruction, supervise office staff, Title I administrator
Quisenberry, Dennis	Assistant Principal	Student Affairs, Facilities and Operations, Safety and Security
Morales, Jinellie	Teacher, K-12	MTSS coordinator, intervention specialist, testing coordinator

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Oak Hammock Middle School Improvement Plan was a collaborative effort between parents, students, teachers, staff, administration, and community members to drive the continual growth of the school. The parents, teachers, staff, and students had involvement in the process through surveys and School Advisory Council meetings during the close of the FY23 school. This information collected from them was paired with the state assessment data and analyzed by the academic leadership team. This team is comprised of teachers, staff, and administration who have a variety of roles and subject areas in the school. Based on the synthesis of this information, the team developed the SIP to drive the school's progress forward.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP team will meet on a quarterly basis to review ongoing state and local progress monitoring data for Oak Hammock Middle School. The team will continue to communicate with and incorporate the ideas of the School Advisory Committee during these reviews. As changes are needed, the team will update the SIP.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	132	144	384
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	15	20	79
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	191	211	579
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	189	192	552
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	191	211	579

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	342	504	377	1223

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	132	144	384
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	15	20	79
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	191	211	579
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	189	192	552
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	191	211	579

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	342	504	377	1223

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	35	48	49	40	48	50	42		
ELA Learning Gains				44			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			31		
Math Achievement*	45	56	56	45	32	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				53			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			34		
Science Achievement*	37	45	49	37	51	53	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	42	64	68	53	53	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	79	80	73	74	45	49	60		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	22	29	40	34	78	76	37		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	12	Yes	4	4
ELL	29	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	45			
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	24	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	45			
HSP	43			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	35			45			37	42	79			22
SWD	10			17			10	14			5	9
ELL	14			30			17	24	67		6	22
AMI												
ASN	67			75							2	
BLK	30			35			33	45	80		5	
HSP	28			41			32	35	76		6	21
MUL	50			51			54	45			4	
PAC												
WHT	59			66			59	62	84		5	
FRL	29			42			34	35	78		6	22

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	44	30	45	53	50	37	53	74			34
SWD	10	30	30	18	45	42	12	20				13
ELL	19	38	32	33	49	50	17	33	71			34
AMI												
ASN	36			82	70							
BLK	38	42	38	33	50	53	33	45	73			
HSP	33	41	30	42	51	50	31	48	73			34
MUL	48	48		45	55			58				
PAC												
WHT	63	54	29	64	60	50	60	75	74			
FRL	34	42	30	40	50	50	30	50	66			35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	49	31	44	40	34	28	57	60			37
SWD	9	23	27	18	29	24	2	31				15
ELL	24	40	29	30	36	34	11	39	46			37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	40	29	32	34	30	19	49	57			
HSP	37	46	31	41	37	34	26	51	58			37
MUL	58	50		64	48							
PAC												
WHT	63	64	35	60	54	32	42	78	68			
FRL	37	44	31	40	37	30	24	52	55			35

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	30%	44%	-14%	47%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	47%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	31%	44%	-13%	47%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	37%	-18%	48%	-29%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	60%	-6%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	44%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	39%	46%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	66%	-27%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that had the lowest performance was ELA Achievement. This component had low performance in FY22 and demonstrated a constant downward trend. Preliminary data for FY23 illustrated another downward trend. This constant decline has many contributing factors that have been observed, but the primary factor noted has been staffing. Staffing has been a major issue in the ELA and Reading departments with the highest percentage of vacancies and teachers covering classes through their planning. This staffing issue creates a lack of continuity of instruction for the students and impedes teachers' ability to collaborate around best practices and student data. Additionally, there has been a lack of staffing in the ESOL support department which when paired with coverage for vacancies has limited the ability of the ESOL staff to adequately meet the needs of students. With nearly one third of the school population being classified as English Language Learners, this lack of staffing has had a major effect on this large student population. Finally, staffing impacted this component by the lack of instructional support. Due to vacancies, the literacy coach and english language arts support teacher were not able to facilitate instructional coaching to develop the teachers in this area. These staffing factors combined to have a large impact on the overall success of the students.

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

The data component that had the had the greatest decline in FY22 that continued to be a concern and decline in the FY23 preliminary data was Social Studies Achievement. This decline could be attributed to the departmental instructional staff turnover and correlation with low student performance on ELA Achievement.

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.

The data component that had the had the greatest gap when compared to the state average in FY22 that continued to be a concern and decline in the FY23 preliminary data was Social Studies Achievement. This decline could be attributed to the departmental instructional staff turnover and correlation with low student performance on ELA Achievement.

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

The middle school acceleration area had the biggest improvement with a substantial increase in FY22 and then another large projected increase in the FY23 preliminary data. These increases could be attributed to the focus and support placed on the students placed in Algebra that just made achievement in the prior year. The students identified as needing support were scheduled specifically into a class that targeted the supporting skills in which they were deficient as identified by the team from progress monitoring data from state and local assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our two potential areas of concern are the high percentage of students that have poor attendance and the high percentage of students scoring a level 1 in ELA.

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

1. Develop a tiered system of supports to develop literacy among our students.
2. Utilize motivating factors and parent engagement to increase student attendance.
3. Increase the number of students demonstrating achievement on Science.
4. Develop a more targeted support system for non-proficient students in 7th grade math.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA Achievement is a focus area for two reasons. First, reading is a foundational skill to student success in all of the other tested areas. It is vital for success and under 50% of Oak Hammock students did not demonstrate proficiency. Additionally, this foundational area is one of the biggest struggles for our ESSA subgroups which are not meeting their target, Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners. ELA is our most substantial academic need and addressing this focus area will have the greatest impact on our
students' overall academic success.

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

Increase ELA Achievement from 40% in FY22 to 44% in FY24 as measured by the Spring Florida Assessment for Student Thinking in May 2024.

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

This area of focus will be regularly monitored through the following: FAST ELA progress monitoring windows, district progress monitoring exemplars, school based reading progress monitoring through the iReady, Read180, and System 44 program, and teacher based assessments and grades. Using this layered approached will provide students, teachers, and school leaders with current and actionable data to keep students moving toward reading proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier 1 instruction will follow standards-based instructional guides that follow a state-approved, research-based curriculum with Marzano's high yield instructional strategies. Tier 2 support will be provided to Level-2A/B ELA students by a highly-effective teacher and delivered by planning the students' master schedule with an additional period of reading intervention using iReady/Read180 instructional tools. Tier 2 support will also include a 30 minute intervention block designed to support students based on academic need. Students not demonstrating proficiency in ELA will receive targeted instruction during this time. Tier 3 support will be provided to Level 1 students through core ELA teacher, core reading teachers, and ESE and ELL support staff as needed. This support will require planning the students' master schedule to include reading intervention periods which will include the Tier 2 supports plus a reading period that utilizes System44, ImagineLearning, or another research-based curriculum that meets their specific need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According Hattie's research, an effective multi tiered system of system of supports has a significant impact in student learning. Additionally, the area of ELA and reading has a substantial impact on student success in a variety of academic areas. As a result, this is the primary academic focus for Oak Hammock Middle School.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schedule the students in the appropriate Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 classes.

Person Responsible: Carl Falk (carlkf@leeschools.net)

By When: August 4, 2023 - Revisit after each progress monitoring window.

PLC collaborative teams will use progress monitoring data to develop two week intervention cycles to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: David Howdyshell (davidjh@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year on a biweekly basis

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math Achievement is a focus area due to that fact that the trend in the Math Achievement data is an overall loss in proficiency since FY19. This five year negative trend illustrates the need for focus on the core instructional techniques, data analysis, and targeted interventions.

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

Increase Math Achievement from 45% in FY22 to 53% in FY24 as measured by the Spring Florida Assessment for Student Thinking in May 2024.

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

This area of focus will be regularly monitored through the following: FAST Math progress monitoring windows, district progress monitoring exemplars, school based math progress monitoring through the iReady, ALEKS, SAVVAS, and teacher based assessments and grades. Using this layered approached will provide students, teachers, and school leaders with current and actionable data to keep students moving toward math proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier 1 instruction will follow standards-based instructional guides that follow a state-approved, research-based curriculum with Marzano's high yield instructional strategies. Tier 2 support will be provided to specific Level-2A/B Math students by a highly-effective teacher. This intervention will be delivered by planning the some of the students' master schedule with an additional period of math intervention using high yield strategies and ALEKS instructional tools to support the students' needs. Tier 2 support will also include a 30 minute intervention block designed to support students based on academic need. Students not demonstrating proficiency in Math will receive targeted instruction during this time from a highly-effective instructor. Tier 3 support will be provided to Level 1 students through core Math teacher, Math Instructional Coach, Math Peer Collaborative Teacher, and ESE and ELL support staff as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's research, an effective multi tiered system of system of supports has a significant impact in student learning. As a result, this is the primary academic focus for Oak Hammock Middle School.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science Achievement is a focus area due to that fact that the trend in the Science Achievement data shows the school maintaining a significant gap below the state and district achievement averages since FY19. This five year negative trend illustrates the need for focus on the core instructional techniques, data analysis, and targeted interventions.

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

Increase Science Achievement from 37% in FY22 to 43% in FY24 as measured by the Spring Florida Assessment for Student Thinking in May 2024.

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

This area of focus will be regularly monitored through the following: performance matters progress monitoring windows, district progress monitoring exemplars, and teacher based assessments and grades. Using this layered approached will provide students, teachers, and school leaders with current and actionable data to keep students moving toward science proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Targeted instruction coaching
Tier 1 - Data analysis and responsive teaching
Tier 2 - Student standard based intervention support.
Tier 3 - Small group instruction with Science Coach

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According Hattie's research, an effective multi tiered system of system of supports has a significant impact in student learning. As a result, this is the primary academic focus for Oak Hammock Middle School.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance is essential to the success of all students, but it is even more vital that students who are english language learners are present in school to participate in high quality tier 1 instruction and receive the ESOL supports that will help them move toward proficiency in their academic areas. Overall, the students at Oak Hammock Middle School attended at a rate lower than the state defined good attendance rate of 90% (88.54% average daily attendance rate at OHMS). Students identified as being english language learners needing support attended at a rate even lower (86.28 average daily attendance rate OHMS - LY students).

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

Increase average daily attendance rate from 88.54% in FY23 to 91.54% in FY24 as measured by the Focus average daily attendance record in June 2024.

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

The school attendance team will monitor the average daily attendance rate weekly and monthly using the attendance reports in Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Howdyshell (davidjh@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

For all our students, the school will provide parents and students with information about the benefits of good attendance and upcoming incentives for students who have good attendance. The PBIS team will provide incentives for students who meet attendance goals for the month and quarter.

Our attendance PLC will track students with lower attendance, and connect teachers with the data illustrating poor student attendance on a monthly basis. Teachers will make parent contacts to address poor attendance and make sure parents are aware of the overall concerns regarding attendance. School administration and the attendance team will provide parents of students with poor attendance information regarding their students attendance and supports to help their student.

For students who fall in the lowest attendance rates, school administration and the social worker will connect with families and work through the process for truant students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student attendance has been shown in research to have a large impact on student success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student discipline infractions are interruption to student learner through loss of class time, off task behaviors, and lack of academic focus. Students with disabilities at Oak Hammock Middle School are committing non-SESIR discipline infractions at a disproportionately higher rate (33%) to the overall school population (31%).

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

Decrease non-SESIR discipline infractions from 1.37 per student from FY23 to 1.23 per student in FY24 as measured by the Focus Analytics Discipline 2.0 report in June 2024.

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

The PBIS team will have daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly reports to share with teachers to track trends in student behavior, teacher reporting, and utilization of PBIS supports. Student behavior trends and teacher reporting information will come directly from the Focus Analytics Discipline 2.0 report. The PBIS strategy implementation will come from the collection of the PBIS currency (Osprey Bucks) that are tied to a teacher number and positive incentive category that is either an academic positive behavior or a peer/teacher interaction positive behavior. Data from these reports will be shared out on a weekly and monthly frequency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dennis Quisenberry (dennisqu@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school will clearly communicate the expectations for good behavior with students, parents, and staff utilizing the Lee County Code of Conduct for students and the OHMS student handbook. Oak Hammock Middle School has set clear RISE Expectations that identify respect, integrity, service, and excellence as key behaviors that are exhibited by successful students. The school PBIS team will work to provide positive incentives for students that will be tied to RISE expectations and Osprey Buck rewards. The team will provide regular opportunities for students to be celebrate for positive behaviors. Additionally, the team will track school wide discipline infraction data to adjust the emphasis and implementation of these PBIS supports to ensure that progress is being made in the identified areas. Targeted professional development will be provided to staff to help support areas of identified need throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Bradshaw, Waasdrop and Leaf reported in the journal of Pediatrics that the multilevel results indicated significant effects of SWPBIS on children's behavior problems, concentration problems, social-emotional functioning, and prosocial behavior. Children in SWPBIS schools also were 33% less likely to receive an office discipline referral than those in the comparison schools.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student discipline infractions are interruption to student learner through loss of class time, off task behaviors, and lack of academic focus. Students with disabilities at Oak Hammock Middle School were suspended either in school (ISS) or out of school (OSS) 32% of the time which results in a substantial interruption of instruction.

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

Decrease discipline infractions resulting in ISS or OSS from 32% (799 actions / 2436 total) from FY23 to 29% of discipline actions resulting in ISS or OSS in FY24 as measured by the Focus Analytics Discipline 2.0 report in June 2024.

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

The PBIS team will have daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly reports to share with teachers to track trends in student behavior, teacher reporting, and utilization of PBIS supports. Student behavior trends and teacher reporting information will come directly from the Focus Analytics Discipline 2.0 report. The PBIS strategy implementation will come from the collection of the PBIS currency (Osprey Bucks) that are tied to a teacher number and positive incentive category that is either an academic positive behavior or a peer/teacher interaction positive behavior. Data from these reports will be shared out on a weekly and monthly frequency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Jinellie Morales (jinelliem@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school will clearly communicate the expectations for good behavior with students, parents, and staff utilizing the Lee County Code of Conduct for students and the OHMS student handbook. Oak Hammock Middle School has set clear RISE Expectations that identify respect, integrity, service, and excellence as key behaviors that are exhibited by successful students. The school PBIS team will work to provide positive incentives for students that will be tied to RISE expectations and Osprey Buck rewards. The team will provide regular opportunities for students to be celebrate for positive behaviors. Additionally, the team will track school wide discipline infraction data to adjust the emphasis and implementation of these PBIS supports to ensure that progress is being made in the identified areas. Targeted professional development will be provided to staff to help support areas of identified need throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Bradshaw, Waasdrop and Leaf reported in the journal of Pediatrics that the multilevel results indicated significant effects of SWPBIS on children's behavior problems, concentration problems, social-emotional functioning, and prosocial behavior. Children in SWPBIS schools also were 33% less likely to receive an office discipline referral than those in the comparison schools.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and % of ESE students for academic support and funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans, as appropriate, there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high-quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Principal supervisors monitor student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No