



School Level Improvement Plan

School Name: Oakdale Middle School	LEA #: 0405039	Plan Year: 2022-23
Building Principal: Dr. Jeff Hernandez	Improvement Plan Team: All Teachers, Dana Finne, Rebekah Davis, LaDonna Baker, David Smith, Jeff Hernandez.	

2021 ESSA Indicator Scores

Overall ESSA Score: 67.15
 Weighted Achievement Score: 53
 School Value-Added Growth Score: 81.43
 School Quality and Student Success Score: 52.57

District Goal:

By the end of the 21-22 school year, the # of 3rd-10th graders scoring ready and exceeding will increase 10% in English, Reading, Science, and Math as measured by the ACT Aspire.

Literacy Goal: By the end of the 2021-22 school year, increase the percentage of students who are meeting their typical growth goal by 10% on the i-Ready reading diagnostic in 6th-8th grade by focusing on Tier 1 instruction and evidence-based science of reading strategies. (6th = 65%; 7th = 59%; 8th = 78%)

Data Dive

Areas of Strength:

- Last year (2020/2021) 59% of OMS students met their typical growth goal on the reading i-Ready diagnostic.
 - 6th Grade: 49%

- 7th Grade: 68%
- 8th Grade: 59%
- Professional development in departments, PLCs, and PD days
- Tier 1 StudySync curriculum (grade-level, complex text)

Areas of Opportunity:

- Last year (2020/2021) 25% of OMS students met their stretch growth goal on the reading i-Ready diagnostic.
 - 6th Grade: 22%
 - 7th Grade: 30%
 - 8th Grade: 21%
- Train teachers/students to track i-Ready data and growth.
- Increase teacher preparedness to use reading strategies backed by the science of reading.
- ACT Aspire Readiness Ranges:

	In Need of Support	Close	Ready	Exceeding	2022 Readiness Goal
6th	42%	26%	18%	14%	42%
7th	33%	35%	26%	7%	43%
8th	24%	29%	29%	19%	58%

Aspire Sub-pops

% Need of Support/Close	Key Ideas & Details	Craft & Structure	Integ. of Know. & Ideas
ELL	6th: 81% 7th: 86% 8th: 74%	6th: 84% 7th: 85% 8th: 73%	6th: 82% 7th: 86% 8th: 53%
African American	6th: 60% 7th: 80% 8th: 77%	6th: 40% 7th: 90% 8th: 77%	6th: 40% 7th: 80% 8th: 54%
Hispanic	6th: 72% 7th: 72% 8th: 62%	6th: 79% 7th: 71% 8th: 64%	6th: 70% 7th: 78% 8th: 43%
White	6th: 56% 7th: 55%	6th: 64% 7th: 55%	6th: 62% 7th: 69%

	8th: 45%	8th: 41%	8th: 31%
IEP	6th: 80% 7th: 92% 8th: 93%	6th: 84% 7th: 95% 8th: 86%	6th: 82% 7th: 97% 8th: 86%
Economically Disadvantaged	6th: 71% 7th: 74% 8th: 59%	6th: 76% 7th: 73% 8th: 61%	6th: 70% 7th: 79% 8th: 42%

- May 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic #3 subpop data

LEP

iReady Spring 2021	Reading Level						
Grade/LEP	3 or More Grade Levels Below	2 Grade Levels Below	1 Grade Level Below	Early On Grade Level	Mid or Above Grade Level	Grand Total	On Level and Above
6	90	23	48	25	51	237	32%
N	23	10	31	21	46	131	51%
Y	67	13	17	4	5	106	8%
7	77	30	59	39	62	267	38%
N	22	14	35	28	60	159	55%
Y	55	16	24	11	2	108	12%
8	86	8	43	34	49	220	38%
N	31	3	25	25	45	129	54%
Y	55	5	18	9	4	91	14%
Grand Total	253	61	150	98	162	724	36%

SPED

iReady Spring 2021	Reading Level						
Grade/SpEd	3 or More Grade Levels Below	2 Grade Levels Below	1 Grade Level Below	Early On Grade Level	Mid or Above Grade Level	Grand Total	On Level and Above
6	90	23	48	25	51	237	32%
N	62	22	45	20	49	198	35%
Y	28	1	3	5	2	39	18%
7	77	30	59	39	62	267	38%
N	51	28	55	38	60	232	42%
Y	26	2	4	1	2	35	9%
8	86	8	43	34	49	220	38%
N	66	7	40	33	49	195	42%
Y	20	1	3	1		25	4%
Grand Total	253	61	150	98	162	724	36%

GENDER

iReady Spring 2021	Reading Level						
Grade/Gender	3 or More Grade Levels Below	2 Grade Levels Below	1 Grade Level Below	Early On Grade Level	Mid or Above Grade Level	Grand Total	On Level and Above
6	90	23	48	25	51	237	32%
female	40	15	26	8	19	108	25%
male	50	8	22	17	32	129	38%
7	77	30	59	39	62	267	38%
female	30	7	24	22	33	116	47%
male	47	23	35	17	29	151	30%
8	86	8	43	34	49	220	38%
female	40	2	17	17	24	100	41%
male	46	6	26	17	25	120	35%
Grand Total	253	61	150	98	162	724	36%

What else do we want to know?

- How will the regular implementation of sentence-level writing and reading activities across content areas be used to assess student reading comprehension and to develop their ability to express complex thoughts in expository writing?
- How does oral language development impact students' ability to complete sentence-level writing/reading with proficiency?
- What will intervention look like for students with reading foundation gaps?

How are we measuring our goal? (Lag Measure) Comparing data from last year.

Previous Aspire and i-Ready data.

How do we know we are making progress towards our goal? (Lead Measure)	Timeline (When Lead Measures occur)	Scoreboard (Results of Lead Measures)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fall, Winter and Spring i-Ready Diagnostics 2. Sentence-level writing/reading activities and assessments (in ELA, literacy applications, social studies) 3. Text-centered common assessments 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. September, December, May 2. Weekly from September-May 3. Pacing of assessments to occur throughout the units/year 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. i-Ready READING Diagnostic Results report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Diagnostic 3 will not occur until May, so the data shows Fall to Winter results. b. Grade 6: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, there was a 10% increase in the number of students on grade level. c. Grade 7: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, there was a 4% increase in the number of students on grade level. d. Grade 8: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, there was a 9% increase in the number of students on grade level. e. In each grade level, the number of students in red decreased by at least 5%. As a result, the number of students one grade level below (yellow) increased, which is good to see. These are the bubble students. i-Ready READING Diagnostic Growth report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> f. Diagnostic 3 will not occur until May, so the data shows Fall to Winter growth.

- g. **Typical growth** goals are annual goals that are specific to student performance. By Diagnostic 3, this goal is what a typical student would meet who is performing at that level.
- h. **Stretch growth** goals are goals that go beyond typical annual performance in growth.
- i. Grade 6: 51% of students met their typical growth goal; while 14% met their stretch growth goal.
 - i. # of students w/improved placement: 45%
- j. Grade 7: 48% of students met their typical growth goal; while 16% met their stretch growth goal.
 - i. # of students w/improved placement: 48%
- k. Grade 8: 48% of students met their typical growth goal; while 17% met their stretch growth goal.
 - i. # of students w/improved placement: 43%

2. *The Writing Revolution*

- a. 8 ELA teachers have received *The Writing Revolution* training courses. Literacy Applications have received training from the literacy facilitator and other PD sessions.
- b. Teachers create sentence-level common assessments every quarter. Students are expected to achieve 80% mastery after initial Tier 1 instruction. If this doesn't happen, PLCs work to assess Tier 1 instruction and support students who did not reach this goal.
- c. Social Studies teachers have received note-taking and sentence-level training from the literacy facilitator.

3. Text-centered common assessments

- a. Teachers create at least 4

		<p>common assessments a quarter centered around the texts they are teaching.</p> <p>b. The StudySync curriculum provides text-centered questions that drive instruction and assessment.</p>
--	--	---

Action Steps	Success Indicators	Evidence/Artifacts (Links)	Timeline
Universal screeners and reading assessments	<p>Students who score below or well below on MAZE will take the ORF.</p> <p>Students who score below or well below on ORF will take the PAST.</p>	<p><i>Universal Screeners:</i> MAZE Upper-spelling Inventory</p> <p><i>Assessments:</i> Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) PAST</p>	August-September Reading data ORF
ELA/LA/SS sentence-level training, the Hochman Method in <i>The Writing Revolution</i> (in accordance with Science of Reading training from the State)	Regular training in departments, PLCs, and PD days for the 2021-22 school year.	Activities embedded in teacher lessons and classes.	September-May
PLCs will create text-centered common formative assessments (in accordance with Science of Reading training from the State).	CFA: 80% of students are successful without intervention	Teacher grade book & CFA data	September-May
i-Ready training and student goal-setting	<p>i-Ready diagnostic data (growth goals)</p> <p>Student tracking progress toward growth goal.</p>	<p>Student i-Ready presentation</p> <p>Student goal setting document</p>	August-December

<p>Tier 1 and 2 intervention in class and during Patriot Plus (intervention time)</p>	<p>CFA: 80% of students are successful without intervention</p> <p>i-Ready diagnostic data (growth goals)</p>	<p>6-8 Literacy Intervention plan</p> <p>Example common formative assessment (6th grade)</p>	<p>September-May</p>
<p>Tier 1 evidence-based reading strategies focus and feedback to teachers</p>	<p>Academic facilitators giving feedback to 5-10 teachers a week.</p> <p>Administrators give feedback to all teachers on 3 week rotation.</p>	<p>Facilitator Drop-in form</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough feedback forms</p> <p>Building professional development on evidence-based literacy strategies.</p>	<p>September-May</p> <p>Comprehensive Needs Assessment</p>

Math Goal:

- 1.) By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the number of 6th-8th grade students scoring in the Readiness Range will increase by 10%, as measured by the ACT Aspire Summative Assessment, through an increased focus on data-supported tier-one classroom teaching strategies.
- 2.) By the end of the 2021-2022 school year the number of 6th-8th ESOL and FRL students scoring in the Readiness Range will increase by 10%, as measured by the ACT Aspire Summative Assessment, through an increased focus on data-supported tier-one classroom teaching strategies,
- 3.) By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, there will be a 10% increase in the percentage of students meeting their typical growth goal on the i-Ready Math Diagnostic in 6th-8th grade, through an increased focus on data-supported tier one classroom teaching strategies, 6th =66% 7th = 56% 8th =67%

Data Dive

Areas of Strength:

Last year (2020/2021) 52% of OMS students met their typical growth goal on iReady.

6th Grade: 46%

7th Grade: 57%

8th Grade: 53%

Areas of Opportunity:

In all domains measured on the **i-Ready Diagnostic**, less than half of OMS students are scoring on or above grade level.

ALL	Number & Operations	Algebra & Algebraic Thinking	Measurement & Data	Geometry
6th	50%	39%	40%	34%
7th	40%	31%	41%	32%
8th	31%	29%	40%	33%

ESOL	On or Above Grade Level	1 Grade Level Below	2 or More Grade Levels Below
6th	20%	18%	62%
7th	11%	40%	58%
8th	5%	37%	58%

SPED	On or Above Grade Level	1 Grade Level Below	2 or More Grade Levels Below
6th	15%	10%	75%
7th	11%	14%	76%
8th	4%	4%	91%

As measured by the **ACT Aspire**, less than half of OMS students are scoring in the Readiness Range for math.

ALL	In Need of Support	Close	Ready	Exceeding	Readiness Range
6th	20%	42%	31%	7%	37%
7th	31%	35%	23%	11%	34%
8th	38%	26%	21%	15%	36%

ESOL	In Need of Support	Close	Ready	Exceeding	Readiness Range
6th	16%	70%	12%	3%	15%
7th	30%	53%	15%	1%	16%
8th	45%	43%	10%	1%	11%

FRL	In Need of Support	Close	Ready	Exceeding	Readiness Range
6th	12%	48%	31%	6%	37%
7th	21%	46%	39%	3%	42%
8th	34%	37%	20%	8%	28%

SPED	In Need of Support	Close	Ready	Exceeding	Readiness Range
6th	23%	56%	15%	2%	17%
7th	58%	32%	10%	0%	10%
8th	72%	16%	13%	0%	13%

What else do we want to know?

- How do we capitalize on the teaching and learning of foundational skills so that students become critical thinkers in math?
- What is causing the discrepancy between scores on classroom-based assessments and scores on diagnostics and state tests?
- What does math literacy instruction look like in our classrooms?

How are we measuring our goal? (Lag Measure) Comparing data from last year.

i-Ready Spring Diagnostic
ACT Aspire Summative Math Scores

How do we know we are making progress towards our goal? (Lead Measure)

- Fall, Winter and Spring iReady Diagnostics
- CFA's
- Cool downs

Timeline (When Lead Measures occur)

- iReady Diagnostics: September, December, May
- CFA's 7-10 times throughout the course of the school year
- Cool Downs: Several times per

Scoreboard (Results of Lead Measures)

iReady Fall to Winter Diagnostic Data

- Diagnostic 3 will not occur until May, so all data summary statements are based on fall to winter data

Grade 6: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 there was a 15% increase in students scoring

	week	<p>on grade-level</p> <p><u>Grade 7</u>: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 there was a 6% increase in students scoring on grade-level</p> <p><u>Grade 8</u>: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 there was a 9% increase in students scoring on grade-level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In each grade level, the number of students in red (3 or more grade levels below) decreased by at least 5% <p>iReady Fall to Winter Diagnostic Growth Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diagnostic 3 will not occur until May, so all data summary statements are based on fall to winter data <p><u>Grade 6</u>: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, 42% of students met their typical growth goals. 10% met their annual stretch growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 46% of students had improved grade-level placement <p><u>Grade 7</u>: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, 32% of students met their typical growth goals. 6% met their annual stretch growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38% of students had improved grade-level placement <p><u>Grade 8</u>: From Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2, 42% of students met their typical growth goals. 15% met their annual stretch growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% of students had improved grade-level placement <p>Typical growth goals are annual goals that are specific to student performance. By Diagnostic 3, this goal is what a typical student would meet</p> <p>Stretch growth goals are goals that go beyond typical annual performance in growth.</p>
--	------	--

Action Steps	Success Indicators	Evidence/Artifacts	Timeline
Continued work on writing	Score 80% or higher on CFA's	iReady Diagnostic data	Ongoing

quality CFA's and then using data to inform instruction		Teacher Gradebook CFA data	
Create daily time for cooldowns and then use cooldown data to inform instruction	Cooldowns happening in math classes multiple times per week	Student work samples Drop-in Form Feedback iReady Diagnostic data	Several times per week
Allow performance with essential standards to guide which students are pulled for RTI	CFA data Teachers are using student performance data to determine RTI groups/lessons Increase in students scoring on grade-level on iReady diagnostics	RTI Scheduler iReady Diagnostic data Sessions	Weekly
Continued work on using the GANAG method when designing tier 1 instruction	KAGAN days 1 and 3 training AF & Admin will see this method being used when doing classroom observations	Teacher lesson plans AF/Admin feedback forms iReady Diagnostic data	Ongoing
Universal Diagnostics	iReady Diagnostic Reports	iReady Diagnostic Reports (See Lead Results section above)	September, December, May
Students setting individual goals for each iReady Diagnostic	Students progress toward their self-identified goal	iReady diagnostic reports iReady Diagnostic data	September, December, May
iReady Data Digs	Teachers look at diagnostic data after each diagnostic	PLC Agendas iReady Diagnostic reports	September, December, May

Additional Site Goal: Reduce number of data points expressing need in the HRS Surveys 1 & 2 by 80% within the current school year.

Data Dive

Areas of Strength: Data points from HRS 1 & 2

The school is perceived as safe by staff, faculty, students, and families.
 The Decision-making process involves teachers.
 Management of fiscal resources
 Communication of clear vision about instruction
 Primary instructional methods are known

Areas of Opportunity: Data points from HRS 1 & 2

Use of social media for anonymous reporting.
 Viewing of video examples of good teaching.
 Data teams need to be in place with goals.
 Teachers have formal ways of providing input about the functioning of the school.
 School leaders regularly talk to me about my evaluation data

What else do we want to know?

What do students perceive about instruction and safety at the school?

How students think we could make the school better.

What are the key points that are making attendance decline as students move through our system?

How are we measuring our goal? (Lag Measure) Comparing data from last year.

HRS surveys (initial year data 21-22) The lag measure and lead measure will be concomitant this year. An additional measurement will be student surveys and observation.

How do we know we are making progress towards our goal? (Lead Measure)

*Future HRS surveys

*Student Surveys

Timeline (When Lead Measures occur)

Learning Cycle 4

Learning Cycle 7

Scoreboard (Results of Lead Measures)

*Initial HRS 1 and 2 given (strengths and opportunities listed above)

Action Steps	Success Indicators	Evidence/Artifacts	Timeline
Creation of social media mechanism for reporting purposes.	Use of and communication documentation to the public.	Product and communication of social media products.	September - November
Formulate a CWT sheet for administrators and regularly submit the feedback to the principal and teacher.	Increase in the quality feedback teachers receive. Improved tier 1 instruction based on the feedback.	Record of the feedback given (triplicate sheet). Drop-in Form	Learning Cycles 2-8

Rogers Public Schools Literacy Plan 2022-2023	K-5	6-8	9-12
Tier 1 Literacy Curriculum	Comprehension, Vocabulary, Morphology, and Writing Wit & Wisdom The Writing Revolution PHONICS Benchmark Phonics: Phonetic Connections & Word Study Phonics First Syllabication PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS Heggerty Kilpatrick's 1 minute Drills WRITTEN PRODUCTION Zaner Bloser Handwriting Learning.Com - keyboarding	Comprehension, Vocabulary, Morphology, and Writing StudySync The Writing Revolution Read 180	Comprehension, Vocabulary, Morphology, and Writing My Perspectives The Writing Revolution Read 180
Dyslexia Intervention Curriculum	Phonics First: Foundations	Phonics First: Structures	
SoR Professional Development	Implementing the Writing Revolution RISE for new hires or new to state Annual SoR training UP4ELs (SoR + support for ELs)	Implementing the Writing Revolution RISE for new hires or new to state Annual SoR training	

Ongoing PD Support	Literacy Facilitator in every building SoR Assessor in each building RPS Look For Documents
Literacy Assessments	RPS Initial Screening iReady Reading Diagnostic ACT Aspire

Continuous Monitoring/Collaboration			
September 7	November 2	February 1st	June 7th
Plan	Progress	Progress	Reflect

Reviewed & Approved by: (Electronic Initial & Date)

Building Principal	Jeff Hernandez 10/6/21	Jeff Hernandez 11/2/22	Jeff Hernandez 2/1/22	Jeff Hernandez 4/13/22
Assistant Superintendent	Jim Davis 10/6/21	Jim Davis 11/2/21	Jim Davis 2/1/22	Jim Davis 4/13/22

Evaluation Date (Reviewed w/Stakeholders):	Spring 2022
---	-------------