

Brevard Public Schools

James Madison Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

James Madison Middle School

3375 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Travis Di ESE L J

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

James Madison Middle School

3375 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 7-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>74%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>36%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

James Madison Middle School's mission is to meet the educational needs of each student through P.R.I.D.E.

Provide the school's vision statement.

James Madison Middle School's vision is to provide a safe, collaborative learning community that develops productive citizens and continues to strengthen the foundation for college and career readiness.

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
Flora, Joseph	Principal	
Watkins, Lara	Assistant Principal	
Bryan, Katheryn	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Deborah	Instructional Coach	
Postlethweight, Brittany	Assistant Principal	
Cumbo, Penny	Teacher, K-12	
Clarke, Cris	Instructional Coach	

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	279	256	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	34	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	25
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	131	125	0	0	0	0	256
	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	115	120	0	0	0	0	235

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/18/2019

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	100	29	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	68	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	76	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	94	0	0	0	0	224

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	39%	59%	54%	42%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	56%	54%	43%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	48%	47%	29%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	66%	58%	45%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	35%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	37%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	52%	51%	42%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	75%	72%	66%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	279 (0)	256 (0)	535 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	37 ()	34 ()	71 (0)
One or more suspensions	14 ()	11 ()	25 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	131 ()	125 ()	256 (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	33%	58%	-25%	52%	-19%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	43%	63%	-20%	56%	-13%
	2018	43%	65%	-22%	58%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	52%	62%	-10%	54%	-2%
	2018	50%	62%	-12%	54%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	23%	43%	-20%	46%	-23%
	2018	19%	41%	-22%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	53%	-9%	48%	-4%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	50%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	74%	-6%	71%	-3%
2018	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
Compare		-2%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
Compare		24%			

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	21	40	31	20	33	30	13	39			
BLK	24	40	32	23	33	31	15	55	58		
HSP	38	44	31	71	63		56	75	71		
MUL	52	54		52	58		36	80			
WHT	42	41	35	57	54	53	51	70	74		
FRL	35	43	35	44	46	36	41	63	67		
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	12	29	33	16	38	33	24	36			
BLK	30	33	19	24	40	27	28	56	70		
HSP	33	39	33	39	42	50	8	59	60		
MUL	38	58		44	61	67	40	64	100		
WHT	49	45	45	53	47	39	47	75	65		
FRL	41	43	37	42	48	37	34	66	59		
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	12	30	20	10	32	34	19	32			
BLK	21	30	25	21	30	22	22	44	60		
HSP	29	42	64	42	45	45	47	56			
MUL	43	37		46	33		30	59	91		
WHT	48	46	25	50	35	42	46	73	64		
FRL	33	40	29	36	35	35	32	63	60		

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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

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%	

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

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

Black/African American Students	
----------------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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	53
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	46
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.

In the 2017-2018 school year, our 7th grade cohort had an ELA pass rate of 43%. In the 2018-2019 school year, our 7th grade cohort dropped 10% to a 33% pass rate. Our ELA department had some substantial struggles regarding standards-based instruction and engaging lessons, as well as maintaining high expectations for all students. Our 7th grade cohort was unable to accel in grade-level work due to minimal exposure to complex texts, low expectations from teachers, and assignments and assessments that were not on grade level.

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

Across the board, our ELA scores dropped in ELA overall achievement (44% to 39%), ELA learning gains (43% to 42%), ELA lowest 25th percentile (40% to 35%) in the 2018-2019 school year. While we know the overall achievement directly ties into our learning gains and lowest 25th percentile, it was concerning to see a 5% drop with our lowest quartile. We believe this drop occurred due to a misalignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. Maintaining high expectations for all students is something that was not happening in our ELA classes, which resulted in expectations, assignments, and assessments not challenging students and pushing them toward being on grade-

level. As a result, our lowest 25% struggled to perform at grade-level and achieved small, if any, learning gains.

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.

Our ELA overall achievement was at 44% in the 2017-2018 school year and was 9% below the state average. The ELA overall achievement in the 2018-2019 school year fell to 39%, resulting in not only a 5% decrease on a school level from the year before, but dropped us 15% below the state average of 54%. We also noticed a 6% decrease in the overall ELA achievement for our African-American students, which dropped from 30% in 2017-2018, to 24% in 2018-2019. We believe that minimal exposure to complex texts, low expectations from teachers, and assignments and assessments not on grade level are major components as to the decrease in these scores. We also identified teachers grading for completion did not support student achievement and growth within the standards.

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

Our Geometry EOC pass rate went from 76% in 2017-2018 to 100% in 2018-2019, which is a 24% increase. Our geometry teacher utilized engaging lessons, standards-based instruction, district-approved curriculum resources and materials, provided weekly tutoring opportunities, and maintained high expectations for all students. As a result of all of these interventions, every single one of our Geometry students passed the EOC. We know that engaging and standards-based instruction, as well as maintaining high expectations for all students played an incredibly pivotal role in the achievement of our students.

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

Our biggest area of concern from the EWS data is the number of students who received a level one on a state assessment. We have 131 7th grade students and 1125 8th grade students receiving a level one on a state assessment. This data shows us that students are not performing on grade level either due to ability, opportunity, or motivation. In order to ensure these numbers decrease, we need to understand what state assessment each student scored a one in and find out where the struggle came from. If we are able to do that early on and provide specific supports for each student, we should see an overall decrease from both cohorts.

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

1. ELA 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%
3. Achievement Gap of African American Subgroup
4. Science proficiency
5. Student Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards Based Effective Instruction in ELA
Rationale	Students at Madison saw a decline in FSA ELA scores in the 18-19 school year. School ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains with the lowest 25% decreased as well.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA proficiency in students scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA will increase from 39% to 44%. ELA learning gains will increase from 42% to 47% and ELA learning gains from students in the lowest 25% will increase from 35% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deborah Smith (smith.deborahk@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Madison took part in a two year training delivered by TNTIP. The evidence based strategies used to observe classrooms and provide feedback to teachers will come from the instructional practice guide for coaching. Instructional strategies that will be taught and monitored in ELA classrooms will focus on high quality text use, questioning that is text specific and on grade level and a clear focus on classroom engagement strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Coaching will be conducted based off of the feedback obtained from the IPG tool. Teacher collaboration will be guided by our literacy coach who has been trained in using the IPG tool. Students need to be spending the bulk of their instructional time using high quality text and asked questions that are on grade level.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule ELA teachers with common planning periods. 2. Literacy coach will attend common planning periods for ELA and ILA teachers and provide feedback on lesson planning and instructional delivery. 3. Administration and literacy coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly 4. Provide teachers with professional development led by ELA district resource teacher 5. Administration will conduct frequent observations and provide feedback on instructional delivery and student engagement. 6. Teachers will collaborate to create common assessments and monitor student progress toward mastery of standards.
Person Responsible	Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Closing the Achievement Gap of African American Subgroup
Rationale	Our African American Subgroup proficiency is one of the lowest performing subgroups at Madison Middle School.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA proficiency will increase from 24% to 32%</p> <p>ELA learning gains will increase from 40% to 48%</p> <p>ELA lowest 25% will increase from 32% to 40%</p> <p>Math proficiency will increase from 23% to 31%</p> <p>Math learning gains will increase from 33% to 41%</p> <p>Math lowest 25% will increase from 31% to 39%</p> <p>Science proficiency will increase from 15% to 23%</p> <p>Civics proficiency will increase from 55% to 63%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaboration within PLC's, progress monitoring academic and absenteeism, Opportunity Myth article, Unconscious Bias professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Empower students - Students must feel as though they are a part of the learning environment and that their teachers have high expectations for them and believe they can succeed.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team will monitor the academic progress of African American subgroup each quarter. They will also monitor the attendance and suspension rate of this subgroup. 2. Parents of African American students will be contacted quarterly to review student academic progress and provided with academic supports. 3. Teachers will attend professional development on cultural responsiveness and unconscious bias.
Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Close the Achievement Gap of Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Madison's students with disabilities is the lowest performing subgroup in the school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA proficiency will increase from 21% to 35%</p> <p>ELA learning gains will increase from 40% to 54%</p> <p>ELA lowest 25% will increase from 31% to 45%</p> <p>Math proficiency will increase from 20% to 35%</p> <p>Math learning gains will increase from 33% to 47%</p> <p>Math lowest 25% will increase from 31% to 45%</p> <p>Science proficiency will increase from 13% to 27%</p> <p>Civics proficiency will increase from 40% to 54%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	AVID Strategies for classroom engagement, restorative practices, PBIS, MTSS tier 1 instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will continue to work on tier 1 instruction that is good for every student. Monitoring student progress will allow for just in time support.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide school wide professional development on tier 1 strategies for instructional success. 2. Administration will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to support students in learning strategies. 3. ESE support facilitation teachers will attend training on effective practices to support ESE students. 4. Provide ESE parents with resources on FOCUS to monitor academic progress. 5. Hire an additional support facilitation instructional position. 6. Provide additional IA support in classrooms. Media Assistant will be paid 2 additional hours to become an instructional assistant.
Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Meaning Classroom Instruction
Rationale	Meaningful classroom instruction with an emphasis on student engagement has been a struggle for staff at Madison.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA learning gains increase from 42% to 52%</p> <p>Math learning gains from 51% to 61%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC's, common assessments, coaching cycle, TNTP
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students must feel that school is relevant and connected to their lives. We must close the opportunity gap for students by using evidence-based strategies to improve the achievement level of all students. Encouraging student collaboration, working in groups and reflection time, allows students to process and synthesize information while being more involved in the learning. Providing students with grade level assignments and tasks that lead to real world learning will help to increase the level of participation and engagement.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development will be offered monthly on classroom engagement strategies, restorative practices, setting high expectations and how to assign grade-level assignments. 2. Provide whole day lesson planning with either Madison Instructional Coaches or district resource teachers. 3. Teachers will collaborate weekly in PLC's with instructional coaches. 4. Leadership team will conduct classroom observations and provide coaching and feedback to teachers to improve instructional practices. 5. Teachers will utilize common planning time for lesson planning, assessment creation and common assessment data review. 6. Professional development on AVID instructional strategies will be presented at weekly professional development.
Person Responsible	Brittany Postlethweight (postlethweight.brittany@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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

n/a

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The 10-month assistant principal visited all incoming students to begin building relationships and setting expectations. James Madison Middle School offers a transition day for 6th graders who are our incoming 7th graders. Current National Junior Honor Society and Student Government members escort these students around the campus through MESH courses, they have lunch together, and are exposed to some of the elective class offerings. We also offer a 6th grade parent night as a question and answer session for the parents of our incoming 7th graders. Madison's 10-month Assistant Principal meets with each sixth grade student at their elementary schools in order to build a relationship prior to attending Madison.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

James Madison Middle School has a built in Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). The school administrators, coaches, and guidance personal meet to identify trends and work toward solutions for students who need academic/behavioral support. The guidance and administration teams provide support for students experiencing difficulty with appropriate behavior through conferencing and helping to formulate individual behavior plans. ASP funds are used to support reading and mathematics instruction through before and after school programs.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Advanced Classes

Geometry, Algebra 1 Honors, Algebra, Spanish 1, and Spanish 2, Introduction to Technology High School Credit Courses

Career and Technical Classes

James Madison Middle School has a College Readiness (CR) program in which students apply in order to take advanced classes.

A concentrated effort has been made to ensure students are challenged, yet supported, through advanced classes that meet their learning needs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

n/a