Thomas Jefferson Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thomas Jefferson Middle School

1275 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.jefferson.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Meara Trine J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	45%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (75%)
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

Thomas Jefferson Middle School

1275 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.jefferson.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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.

Thomas Jefferson Middle School's mission is to ensure that every student achieves at their maximum potential in an engaging and challenging learning environment in order to become productive citizens in today's society. (2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Academic and interpersonal success for all students (2019)

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
Trine, Meara	Principal	*Assist all school "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions *Attend all PLC meetings for all departments to assist with developing and implementing targeted interventions for at-risk students *Review progress of SIP and give updates to SAC members at meetings *Review data quarterly to determine student needs for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions *Work with ESE team to ensure that all student's IEP needs are being met
Koch, Lena	Assistant Principal	*Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions *Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students *Review progress of SIP and give updates to the SAC members at meetings *Review data quarterly to determine student needs for Tier 2 intervention
Johnson, Christina	Instructional Coach	-Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1 and Tier 2 Reading interventions -Assists English Language Arts and Reading departments in developing and implementing interventions for their at-risk students -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students
Yates, Nancy	School Counselor	-Organize and run targeted small groups to address specific social-emotional learning targets -Assist all school academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and 3 interventions -Assisting all school academic "teams" in finding workable solutions for the challenges faced by ESE students in the general education classroom -Work directly with Support Facilitators to ensure that all student's IEP needs are being met -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to assist with developing and implementing targeted interventions for ESE students

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	351	342	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	65	0	0	0	0	115

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	33	40	0	0	0	0	73

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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)

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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	108	90	0	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	39	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	48	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	36	0	0	0	0	96

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	43	48	0	0	0	0	91

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	63%	59%	54%	66%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	54%	66%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	58%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	66%	58%	70%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	63%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	45%	51%	41%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	52%	51%	62%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	75%	72%	81%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	351 (0)	342 (0)	693 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	44 ()	47 ()	91 (0)
One or more suspensions	10 (0)	7 (0)	17 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (0)	22 (0)	40 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	50 (0)	65 (0)	115 (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	57%	58%	-1%	52%	5%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	69%	63%	6%	56%	13%
	2018	73%	65%	8%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	60%	62%	-2%	54%	6%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	39%	43%	-4%	46%	-7%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	60%	53%	7%	48%	12%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	50%	16%
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	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
2018	80%	73%	7%	71%	9%
Compare		-3%			

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	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	60%	37%	57%	40%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

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	25	42	36	36	37	36	20	47	60		
ELL	41	56	50	63	61						
ASN	59	67		82	53				83		
BLK	30	40	25	33	32	33	33	69			
HSP	58	50	52	63	46	50	52	69	81		
MUL	68	57	64	73	51	30	65	83	91		
WHT	66	59	49	76	52	50	63	79	87		
FRL	50	51	45	59	46	42	51	65	74		

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	46	42	27	42	40	29	44	30		
ELL	29	69	62	43	38						
ASN	38	55		85	82						
BLK	21	44	50	35	26	25	17	43			
HSP	52	53	56	65	56	35	47	74	76		
MUL	66	61	58	71	75		69	86	81		
WHT	69	57	54	78	66	57	72	82	82		
FRL	54	48	51	64	57	44	52	72	66		

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	25	48	43	31	42	36	26	49	40		
ELL					80						
BLK	37	62	53	38	40	8	25				
HSP	55	64	71	62	66	53	55	75	71		
MUL	55	59	50	64	56		55	69	63		
WHT	71	67	55	73	64	44	66	83	80		
FRL	51	56	51	56	49	37	51	71	59		

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	58
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	65
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	65
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.

Our African American and Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance.
In regards to the large influx of students with disabilities, our school has had to undergo major instructional shifts to meet the academic and behavioral needs of our students. Last year was the second year that Jefferson utilized a strategic case management model to track ESE student performance. Prior to the implementation of this process, some general education teachers with ESE certification were held responsible for writing IEPs and ensuring compliance. The support facilitation/ case manager model has forced a transformation in how ESE and general education teachers work together and plan. This ongoing process has required a change to school culture and a reassembling of pedagogical ideology.
Nearly 70% of our African American students received multiple referrals (24 students garnered 159 referrals), which resulted in fractured relationships with some staff members. As a result, these students were less willing to participate appropriately in class and struggled with self-regulation and task compliance. Jefferson mirrors the national trend of struggling to provide African American students with culturally responsive instruction that honors the unique and important qualities of the African American student.

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

Primary areas of decline include the following:
-ELA Lowest 25%, down 7%
-Math Learning gains, down 13%
-Science Achievement, down 7%
All three of these categories were impacted by placing first year teachers in these subject areas. Subsequently, we had a high rate of turnover mid-year and this disrupted the continuity of instruction. All three of these subject areas were assigned to long-term subs, most of which did not have any experience teaching in the middle school classroom. As a result of the frequent changes in staffing, student behavioral concerns were mismanaged and the disruption to learning intensified.

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 lower math learning gains amongst the lowest 25% are symptomatic of the larger overall trends in our data. Due to new teacher turnover, disrupted instructional continuity, and subsequent behavioral issues the students representative of this category did not succeed in producing learning gains. Some of our ESE and African American students are represented within this subgroup and were impacted by the factors previously outlined.

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

ELA Learning Gains demonstrated a 2% increase as compared to school average for the 2017-2018 school year. New teachers were assigned in our 8th grade ELA and Reading departments. Their expertise, commitment, and ability to build genuine rapport was paramount to helping under-achieving students produced positive results. ELA teachers also worked strategically with ESE Support Facilitators to develop interventions to produce learning gains. These strategies included small group instruction for remedial skills,lunch time study halls to complete missing or incomplete classwork, and common planning time to discuss and review student data.

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

Primary areas of concern are rates of attendance below 90% and students achieving an FSA Score of Level 1 in Math and Language Arts.

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

1. Math Lowest 25%
2. African American Students
3. Students With Disabilities
4. Professional Learning Communities
5. Student Engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Learning Gains amongst the Lowest Performing 25% of Students
Rationale	This area of focus represents the intersectionality of many larger data trends within our learning community. By addressing this area of concern we are able to target students achieving a Level 1 on FSA math, some ESE students, and some African American students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, students within the lowest performing 25% will show an overall increase of 3-5% in Math Learning Gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Department based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Copious research has underscored the efficacy of utilizing PLCs to promote feelings of supportive learning communities, tracking student growth, and making instructional decisions based on pertinent data. This year, all departments will meet weekly in PLCs to monitor student progress. In order to increase accountability, these meetings will be attended by members of administration and the leadership team to collaborate with classroom teachers in devising targeted interventions. Student data will be reviewed weekly to ensure that interventions are being implemented. A growth-mindset will be promoted during discussions to cultivate a positive, hopeful energy that will be carried into the classroom.

Action Step	
Description	1. During pre-planning, all teachers will be informed of the individual roles and responsibilities pertaining to PLC meetings. Calendar of meetings dates will also be disseminated during this discussion. 2. During PLC meetings departments will use student data to identify and discuss academic and/or behavioral concerns. 3. Administration and leadership will promote honest, positive, solution-focused dialogue to identify tailored solutions to areas of concern which may include, but are not limited to: -Small group remediation -Student engagement strategies based on the Kagan method -PBIS reinforcement strategies -Differentiating instruction 4. Teams will continue to meet weekly to monitor the success of chosen interventions. Areas of data to closely monitor include but are not limited to: students with Ds or Fs as their overall grade in a course, attendance concerns, seat-time missed due to disciplinary action, etc. 5. If interventions are not producing desired results, the team will consult district-level subject area coaches or other support staff for potential solutions
Person Responsible	Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	African American Students
Rationale	Our African American Students are demonstrating levels of performance below the federal benchmark of 41%. Therefore it is imperative that we address the specific concerns regarding student success within this subgroup.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The African American subgroup will show an overall improvement of 3-4% in FSA Math and FSA ELA scores at the end of the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Kagan Student Engagement Strategies Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Kagan strategies are built on a foundation of student collaboration. Collaborative learning encourages students from diverse backgrounds and ability levels to work together to solve problems and provide productive feedback. Young adolescents need the opportunity to socialize and receive social-emotional support from their peers which can be achieved through Kagan's inclusive strategies. These positive, academically-centered interactions can create a feedback loop of student self-efficacy, thereby increasing a favorable association with the teacher and their classroom. PBIS is designed to develop consistent, predictable, and affirming learning atmospheres. Teachers should consistently reinforce moments when students are meeting class, or school-wide expectations. By focusing on positive examples of behavior, teachers can create a classroom that acknowledges the hard work and growth of every student. PBIS also facilitates objective, rational consequences for misbehavior that allow authority figures to be consistent and trustworthy, thereby promoting greater respect among all students and staff members.

Action Step	
Description	Kagan Strategies: 1. All teachers will revisit Kagan strategies discussed during Pre-Planning 2. Administration and leadership will select a "structure of the month" for all faculty to implement in the classroom and will disseminate this information through PLC meetings 3. Administration and leadership will create accountability through informal observations of teachers utilizing Kagan strategies 4. Effectiveness of strategies will be discussed in PLC meetings 5. Student performance will be monitored to determine which strategies are most beneficial PBIS 1. All teachers will receive an updated PBIS (and Discipline In the Secondary Classroom) during Pre-Planning 2. PBIS committee will meet monthly to create and review initiatives and monitor discipline data with an emphasis on under-performing subgroups 3. Classroom teachers will discuss behavioral concerns and solutions during weekly PLCs 4. Administration and Leadership team will review school-wide data to determine areas of

strength and weakness within school-wide PBIS implementation
5. District support staff will be utilized to craft solutions for non-responsive students

Person Responsible | Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Our Students with Disabilities are demonstrating levels of performance below the federal benchmark of 41%. Therefore it is imperative that we address the specific concerns regarding student success within this subgroup.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019-2020 school year students within the subgroup of Students with Disabilities will show an overall increase of 2-3% in learning gains on FSA Math and FSA Language Arts tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Targeted Case Management and Support Facilitation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Support Facilitators are the link between Students with Disabilities and the General Education Classroom. They are the conduit through which learning is made accessible for all ability levels. Student performance will be monitored through the specific assignment of students to individual Support Facilitators (SFs). The SFs will be present in the math and language arts classrooms of most of the students assigned to their caseload. This will promote greater ease of monitoring progress. SFs will plan and collaborate with General Education teachers to devise remediation and/or co-teaching strategies to address students with performance deficits. SFs and the ESE school counselor will routinely track grades and attendance and will meet whenever necessary to edit and revise a student's Individualized Education Plan to better reflect the needed accommodations and services according to the data. The student's academic "team" will also be involved in ensuring implementation of all suggested strategies within the classroom.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review roles and responsibilities of SFs and General Education teachers during pre-planning 2. Student's team (SFs, General Education teachers, ESE school counselor, administrators) will meet at the time of interims to identify students who are not meeting learning gains goals to determine needed interventions 3. SF will contact student's guardian to discuss performance and suggested interventions 4. ESE school counselor will follow up with SFs and student's academic "team" to determine progress and efficacy of interventions and strategies 5. If interventions are determined to be unsuccessful ESE team, student, and student's guardians will meet to amend the IEP and/or BIP (behavior intervention plan)
Person Responsible	Nancy Yates (yates.nancy@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).

Professional Learning Communities: As outlined within the plans for targeted subgroups in need of improvement, PLCs will be a school-wide initiative that will create structures of accountability and support. These weekly meetings will provide a platform for honest, encouraging dialogue among colleagues that will generate solutions to individual and school-wide problems.

Student Engagement: Student engagement will be addressed through multiple initiatives. Kagan structures and strategies will be encouraged in all classrooms to promote collaborative learning and social-emotional growth. Accountability for these structures will be created by the administration's "Structure of the Month" and informal observations in classrooms to answer questions and offer support for implementation.
Student Engagement will also be addressed through promoting greater social-emotional intelligence through targeted small group sessions for students with behavioral and emotional challenges. These students will have greater self-efficacy as it relates to resolving conflicts, dealing with stress and anxiety, and frustration within the classroom. This will improve the student's ability to maintain focus and self-regulate.
Further training in PBIS and DISC among faculty and staff will also address student engagement by offering structures that promote relationship building, task compliance, predictable routines, and logical reinforcements and punishments. By creating this type of environment students will be able to bring a more mindful state of awareness to the process of learning.