



---

## 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Andrew Jackson Middle School

1515 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.jackson.brevard.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Susan Shockley M**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (65%)
<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>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Brevard 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Andrew Jackson Middle School

1515 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.jackson.brevard.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 7-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>61%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>44%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	B	A	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.**

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to providing our students with an environment where students feel supported, think critically, and make informed decisions as lifelong learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to quality education that challenges and motivates our students to reach their highest potential by being STAR Generals (Stay Safe, Take Responsibility, Achieve Academic Excellence, Respect Yourself and Others.)

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Susin, Tina	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team and teacher leaders to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.
Shockley, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team and teacher leaders to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.
Donohue, Christina	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team and teacher leaders to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268	270	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	60	0	0	0	0	121
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	15	24	0	0	0	0	39

**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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	17

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

36

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/19/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0



## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	59%	54%	62%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	54%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	49%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	66%	58%	64%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	55%	57%	64%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	51%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	52%	51%	62%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	75%	72%	85%	76%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	268 (0)	270 (0)	538 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	30 ( )	33 ( )	63 (0)
One or more suspensions	9 (0)	10 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	9 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	61 (0)	60 (0)	121 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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	2019	58%	58%	0%	52%	6%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	62%	63%	-1%	56%	6%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
07	2019	64%	62%	2%	54%	10%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	54%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	33%	43%	-10%	46%	-13%
	2018	36%	41%	-5%	45%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	49%	53%	-4%	48%	1%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
2018	74%	73%	1%	71%	3%
Compare		3%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Compare		21%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	96%	60%	36%	56%	40%
Compare		4%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	48	42	28	44	33	22	51			
ASN	83	58		92	75				100		
BLK	35	43	44	44	50	38	20	56	58		
HSP	48	60	53	63	55	38	42	71	84		
MUL	61	56	50	70	60	33	42	87	100		
WHT	71	67	51	77	65	52	65	85	87		
FRL	49	55	46	58	56	41	35	74	75		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	36	28	25	45	35	21	44			
ELL					40						
BLK	37	43	26	39	50	37	24	65	57		
HSP	52	57	58	57	53	25	42	65	53		
MUL	63	57	60	53	61	43	55	74	69		
WHT	70	57	56	69	55	45	67	83	74		
FRL	52	51	42	50	49	39	41	70	56		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	42	41	23	44	43	14	55			
ASN	73	82		82	91						
BLK	41	51	42	46	57	42	36	78	77		
HSP	49	59	44	59	59	53	50	81	79		
MUL	65	71	45	63	59		60	87	76		
WHT	72	67	55	72	68	58	74	89	79		
FRL	52	57	44	55	58	47	52	80	68		

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	556
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

<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%	

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance at Jackson Middle School was our SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup. The Federal Index for our SWD subgroup is 38 which is below the threshold of 41% for TS&I (Targeted Support and Intervention.). Unfortunately, this was not the first year that our SWD did not perform well. For the past two years in 2018 and 2019, we only had 48% of our lowest 25% of students make learning gains in ELA. One contributing factor was that we had large numbers of SWD in our general education classes due to limited support facilitation teachers.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was in Science achievement. From 2018-2019, we went from 54% proficient to 51% proficient. For the last two years we have not been fully hired in science. Each

year we have one of our four science positions open for part or all of the year. Having multiple short term teachers and substitutes in a classroom for the year is not best practices for effective instruction.

**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 largest gap when compared to the state average was in Math learning gains with the lowest 25% of our students. The state had 51% of the lowest 25% of students achieve learning gains while Jackson only had 43% of the lowest 25% of the students achieve learning gains. One factor that contributed to this was again having large numbers of SWD in our general education classes due to limited support facilitation teachers.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was in math achievement. In 2018, we had 61% of our students that scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA. In 2019, we had 69% of our students that scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA. For the 2017-2018 school year, one of our math teachers was on leave and there was several short term teachers and substitutes in the classroom for the year. For the 2018-2019 school year, we were fully hired in mathematics. In addition for the 2018-2019, we implemented a pull-out math remediation program. Students who needed remediation in math were pulled out of an elective class weekly to work with a retired math teacher to receive math support.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

One area of concern from the EWS data is the number of students with two or more indicators. We currently have 15 seventh graders and 24 eighth graders for a total of 39 students with two or more EWS indicators.

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

1. Increasing Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in Math
2. Increasing Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in ELA
3. Increasing the Federal Index for our SWD subgroup
4. Increasing Science Achievement
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<p>ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%</p> <p>The learning gains for our lowest 25% of students remained the same for 2018 and 2019. Only 48% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain each year. The only area we decreased in last year was science achievement. However, our ELA achievement over all and our the learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA remained the same and did not increase.</p>
<b>Rationale</b>	
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>For the 2019-2020 school year, learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA will increase from 48% to 53%.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	<p>Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Text-based writing with complex text in ELA classrooms Standards Based Instruction PLCs</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>We believe that while our teachers are teaching the standards, they are not reaching the rigor and complexity of the standards. By focusing on text-based writing with complex text aligned to the rigor of the standards, we believe learning gains would increase.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide ELA and ILA teachers two paid days during the summer to work with our Literacy Coach to develop standards based lessons incorporating complex text and writing tasks.</li> <li>2. Provide ELA and ILA teachers a plan day in September to continue the work from the summer and to evaluate student work samples with resource teachers from the District.</li> <li>3. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends observational data. Leadership team will provide feedback on on effective implementation of standards based instruction.</li> <li>4. ELA and ILA teachers will meet twice a month to plan, collaborate, and to analyze student work samples and data.</li> <li>5. ESE teachers and ELA content teachers identify students who are struggling (after implementing SDI's) and refer to IPST to problem-solve.</li> <li>6. Administer common assessments each quarter and analyze the data by subgroup to monitor the progress of our lowest 25% and our students with disabilities (SWD's).</li> <li>7. As part of bi-monthly department meetings, ESE teacher and ELA content teachers plan SDI's for our SWD's.</li> <li>8. Literacy Coach will collaborate with ELA/ILA to align ILA curriculum to best support students in ELA.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	<p>Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)</p>

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	Our learning gains in math for the lowest 25% increased from 40 to 43% this year,. While we did increase from 2018 to 2019, we are still behind the district average of 45% and the state average of 51%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	For the 2019-2020 school year, learning gains for the lowest 25% in math will increase from 43% to 48%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	PLCs High Yield Instructional Strategies Differentiation
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We believe that our poor performance has to do with how we support all students. Differentiation and PLCs will help change this. In addition, coaching in the use of high yield instructional strategies will benefit all students including those in the lowest 25%.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide math teachers a plan day in September to work with District Resource teacher to plan for the use of quality instructional resources and high yield instructional strategies.</li> <li>2. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends observational data. Leadership team will provide feedback on on effective instructional strategies.</li> <li>3. Math teachers and ESE teachers will meet twice a month to plan, collaborate, and to analyze student work samples and data in order to identify students who need additional supports.</li> <li>4. Administer common assessments each unit and analyze the data by subgroup to monitor the progress of our lowest 25% and our students with disabilities.</li> <li>5. Utilize MAP progress monitoring tool for all math students to identify strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>6. Implement IXL as a support program for students in math who are 'on the bubble'.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**