Southwest Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Southwest Middle School

451 ELDRON BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

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

Demographics

Principal: Jasmine Delaughter C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2019

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)	93%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (59%)
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

Southwest Middle School

451 ELDRON BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

http://www.southwest.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	Yes	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

Our mission at Southwest Middle School is to improve student achievement through the development of positive and productive relationships with all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At The Great Southwest, we courageously strive to provide each of our students with the best educational experience possible by helping students meet rigorous moral and academic expectations.

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
Shaw, Ronald	Principal	Ron Shaw's major duties consist of overseeing the entire school. He manages essential school meeting and helps to solve major problems that may present themselves. He also acts as the school's leader and provides guidance to staff and faculty when needed or requested.
Glover, Laura	Assistant Principal	Laura Glover's primary duties is to provide support and implement the state curriculum. She also provides and oversees many other responsibilities such as scheduling, planning events, and heading communications with parents and other stakeholders. Assisting Principal Shaw when needed, Laura Glover provides support in all fashions for the entire school.
Vacca, Ralph	Teacher, K-12	Ralph Vacca's primary duties as a classroom teacher is to provide students with an equal and fair education. Other duties consist of providing a safe learning environment, teaching state learning standards, and to cultivate positive relationships with all students.
Doucimo, Todd	Instructional Coach	Todd Doucimo's primary duties are provide literacy support for all classrooms. Todd also is responsible for hosting professional development training sessions, helping to provide teachers with possible literacy techniques and way to implement them. Todd also maintains a school wide Google Classrooms, providing helpful literacy documents, various important information/data, and provides feedback when needed.
Gordon, Sandy	Teacher, K-12	Sandra Gordan's primary duties as a classroom teacher is to provide students with and equal and fair education. Other duties consist of providing a safe learning environment, teaching state learning standards, and to cultivate positive relationships with all students.
Boyer, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Barbra Boyer's primary duties as a classroom teacher is to provide students with and equal and fair education. Other duties consist of providing a safe learning environment, teaching state learning standards, and to cultivate positive relationships with all 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	477	427	0	0	0	0	904
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	68	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	175	0	0	0	0	348
Level 1 on ELA FSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	89	0	0	0	0	178
Level 1 on Math FSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	85	0	0	0	0	168
	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	215	207	0	0	0	0	422

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	12	5	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	0	0	0	0	29

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
59

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 11/5/2019

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	172	178	0	0	0	0	350
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	92	0	0	0	0	209
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	160	0	0	0	0	366

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	109	126	0	0	0	0	235

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	53%	59%	54%	50%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	54%	51%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	47%	42%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	56%	66%	58%	52%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	55%	57%	49%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	51%	44%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	46%	52%	51%	52%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	75%	72%	68%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	477 (0)	427 (0)	904 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	60 ()	69 ()	129 (0)
One or more suspensions	76 (0)	68 (0)	144 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	8 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	173 (0)	175 (0)	348 (0)
Level 1 on ELA FSA	89 (0)	89 (0)	178 (0)
Level 1 on Math FSA	83 (0)	85 (0)	168 (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	50%	58%	-8%	52%	-2%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	63%	-13%	56%	-6%
	2018	53%	65%	-12%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	28%	43%	-15%	46%	-18%
	2018	37%	41%	-4%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	53%	-9%	48%	-4%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	61%	74%	-13%	71%	-10%
2018	63%	73%	-10%	71%	-8%
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	90%	61%	29%	61%	29%
2018	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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	20	40	40	21	44	43	22	26	60		
ELL	29	42	41	22	42	42	9	41			
ASN	80			90							
BLK	40	45	42	38	48	49	27	46	76		
HSP	48	49	47	48	47	36	37	62	73		
MUL	55	46	30	61	43	45	46	72	79		
WHT	59	53	46	65	53	46	57	69	80		
FRL	49	48	43	51	47	43	39	62	79		

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	18	35	38	21	37	41	23	38	42		
ELL	12	26	27	39	47	25		28			
BLK	38	45	42	42	42	36	28	59	68		
HSP	44	48	40	45	45	39	34	55	65		
MUL	51	41	30	54	53	60	41	65	82		

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
WHT	58	51	56	67	56	57	59	69	73		
FRL	45	47	48	51	50	43	37	60	68		

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	18	37	31	19	40	35	21	36	46		
ELL	18	42	41	24	50	54	25	41			
BLK	36	41	29	37	40	26	36	57	57		
HSP	40	48	36	37	49	49	41	59	51		
MUL	55	45	30	55	36		58	73	73		
WHT	59	56	54	65	53	55	61	77	73		
FRL	43	48	41	47	48	44	45	65	61		

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	55
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	85
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	53
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	59
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	52
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 data component that shows the lowest performance here at The Great Southwest (TGSW) occurs in ELA and Math achievement for our English Language Learners (ELL) and our Students with Disabilities (SWD). While both subgroups posted significant gains in 2019, they remain well behind other subgroups and the school as a whole. Overall ELA achievement is 53% at TGSW; it is 29% for ELLs and 20% for SWD. Overall MATH achievement is 56% at TGSW; it is 22% for ELLs and 21% for SWD.

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

In general, our Math and ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline at 1% and 2% respectively. Additionally, our Math learning gains dropped by 1%. While these are not significant declines, they are concerning none the less. During the 2018-2019 school year TGSW had an extremely high turnover of math instructional personnel. This instructional instability greatly impacted our ability to provide consistent, effective math 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.

Our Social Studies Achievement is 8% below that state average at 64%. Here too, SWMS had a high turnover of instructional personnel. This instructional instability greatly impacted our ability to provide consistent, effective social studies instruction.

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

ELA Achievement and Learning Gains showed our greatest increase at 3% and 2% respectively. These gains are attributed to department utilization of data to drive instruction and instructional coaches working with all teachers to improve instructional delivery and formative data collection. Additionally, we implemented well orchestrated school-wide incentives linked to meeting literacy goals (i.e. 20 Book Challenge) such as New York Times Bestselling authors visits with Kwame Alexander and Jason Reynolds.

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

In reviewing our EWS data, an area of great concern is the number of level 1 students. The 348 students listed represent 42% of the student body. This is a great impediment to student achievement and must be addressed with appropriate strategies and instructional planning.

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

1. Increase ELA and MATH achievement rates for English Language Learners to 35% and 30%, respectively.
2. Increase both ELA and MATH achievement rates to 30% for Students with Disabilities.

3. Increase both ELA and MATH lowest 25th percentile average to 50%.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Achievement of English Language Learners Subgroup
Rationale	Our English Language Learners subgroup achieved an average proficiency rate of 36% on the ESSA Federal Index which reflects a huge achievement gap when compared to our White subgroup proficiency rate of 59% on the ESSA Federal Index.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Southwest Middle School will increase English Language Learners subgroup math and reading proficiency to at least 30% and 35% proficiency, respectively. This represents a 8% and 6% increase, respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Todd Doucimo (doucimo.todd@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Culturally Responsive Teaching and Differentiated Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Preparing teachers with culturally responsive knowledge, attitudes, and skills during pre-service education programs will improve the school success of diverse students. Through proper training, teachers will bridge the gap between instructional delivery and diverse learning styles and establish continuity between how diverse students learn.

Action Step

Description	1.Southwest Middle School will provide professional development to our instructional staff to better support Culturally Responsive Instruction. 2. Administration will ensure teachers are incorporating Culturally Responsive Instructional strategies into their lesson plans. 3. ELL students will be enrolled in Language Live, a district provided online program that aids in language acquisition and reading comprehension. Work with this program is completed via ILA classes. 4. ELL students will be enrolled in an homogeneous ELL ILA class so that the teacher can tailor instruction to the specific needs of this group. 4. Student achievement data will be monitored via MESH team meetings and MTSS. 5. PLC in "Closing The Attitude Gap" for social/personal aspect of teaching. 6. Teachers will utilize the Media Center by making and coordinate lessons with the media specialist.
Person Responsible	Ronald Shaw (shaw.ron@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Achievement of Students with Disabilities Subgroup
Rationale	Our Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved an average proficiency rate of 38% on the ESSA Federal Index which reflects a huge achievement gap when compared to our White subgroup proficiency rate of 59% on the ESSA Federal Index.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Southwest Middle School will increase Students with Disabilities subgroup math and reading proficiency to at least 30% proficiency. This represents a 9% and 10% increase, respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Todd Doucimo (doucimo.todd@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of Differentiated Literacy Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers often request strategies to use with their ESE students. We believe that concerted professional development can bear accelerate student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Southwest Middle School will conduct professional development to our instructional staff providing a variety of content area literacy strategies and techniques. 2. Literacy Coach and SWD teachers will partner with non-SWD content-area teachers to model differentiated instructional strategies. 3. Instructional leaders will facility data analysis and utilize instructional strategies based on student needs. 4. Administration will ensure teachers are embedding appropriate learning strategies into their lesson plans. 5. PLC in "Closing The Attitude Gap" for social/personal aspect of teaching. 6. Teachers will utilize the Media Center by making and coordinate lessons with the media specialist.
Person Responsible	Ronald Shaw (shaw.ron@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile dropped from 46% to 44%. Our Math Lowest 25th Percentile dropped from 46% to 45%. These drops, while currently small, must be addressed in order to prevent larger drops in the future.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Southwest Middle School will increase the ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile averages to 50%. This represents a 6% and 5% increase, respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Todd Doucimo (doucimo.todd@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Tutoring, Data Driven Instruction, and Differentiated Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students identified in the ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile will be enrolled in the Southwest Success Academy which will offer remediation based on each student's classroom performance.
Action Step	
Description	1. Southwest will identify students in the ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile. 2. Southwest will identify teachers to provide this additional support both during school and before/after school hours. 3. Southwest will utilize ASP funds to pay for tutors enrolled in the Southwest Success Academy (before/after school hours). 4. MESH team will facilitate data analysis and utilize instructional strategies based on student needs. 5. Through classroom observations and reviewing of lesson plans, administrators will ensure teachers are providing data-driven and differentiated instruction with fidelity. 6. ELA and ILA will partner to write lessons that reinforce shared skills and standards. 7. Instructional Coach will assist teachers in items 4, 5, & 6 above. 8. Math teachers will monitor students using the district's new MAP assessment system and make instructional adjustments based on that data.
Person Responsible	Ronald Shaw (shaw.ron@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).