

Brevard Public Schools

Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School

2155 CROTON RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Marina Saporito Middleton S

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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 98% |
| 2019-20 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 (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%) |
| 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School

2155 CROTON RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 7-8</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>61%</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>43%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | C | 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.

Johnson Middle School strives to provide all students limitless opportunities to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Johnson Middle School is committed to providing all students limitless opportunities to succeed.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Conneely, Tanza | Assistant Principal | Support the principal to cultivate a collaborative working environment. Coordinate and monitor the development and implementation of school instructional goals, strategies, and outcome measures. Monitor the school improvement planning process. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Middleton, Marina | Principal | Manage and administer the overall activities of assessing, developing and implementing instructional and school programs. Ensure compliance with Board rules and applicable federal laws and regulations. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Tracy, Kavitha | Dean | Student supervision, review and analyze data to facilitate student behavior change, participate in the development and implementation of all school practices and the implementation of school-site safety programs and appropriate drills. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Scott, Roberta | Instructional Coach | Plan and implement professional development opportunities that address both current research and future instructional needs. Provide direct, classroom-based, professional development for teachers through regular modeling of research-based literacy instruction. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Latorre, Rayna | Teacher, K-12 | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Langlie, Ryan | Teacher, K-12 | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Comer, Heidi | Teacher, K-12 | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Ortiz, Mercedita | Teacher, K-12 | Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Moose, Jessica | School Counselor | To provide assistance to students, parents, and teachers in making education, occupational, and life plans. Educate and support students academically, behaviorally, and socially. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------|--|
| Rua, Marcy | Teacher, K-12 | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Oxley, Tracy | Teacher, ESE | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Dismore, Tabetha | Teacher, K-12 | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences.. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Marina Saporito Middleton S

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Demographic Data

| | |
|---|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 98% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students |

| | |
|--|--|
| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 359 | 361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 720 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

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 | 68 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |

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 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 354 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 733 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 |

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 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |

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 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 354 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 733 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 |

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 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |

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 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 58% | 59% | 54% | 54% | 60% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 57% | 56% | 54% | 51% | 57% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 48% | 47% | 40% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 66% | 58% | 65% | 65% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | 55% | 57% | 62% | 56% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 45% | 51% | 49% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 52% | 51% | 48% | 56% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 65% | 75% | 72% | 74% | 76% | 70% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | Total |
| | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2019 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 52% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 51% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 57% | 63% | -6% | 56% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 65% | -8% | 58% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2019 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 54% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 54% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 20% | 43% | -23% | 46% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 13% | 41% | -28% | 45% | -32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 48% | 53% | -5% | 48% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 55% | -10% | 50% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 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 | 64% | 74% | -10% | 71% | -7% |
| 2018 | 64% | 73% | -9% | 71% | -7% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| 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 | 93% | 61% | 32% | 61% | 32% |
| 2018 | 91% | 62% | 29% | 62% | 29% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 60% | 40% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 100% | 60% | 40% | 56% | 44% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

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 | 41 | 41 | 28 | 39 | 33 | 26 | 26 | 75 | | |
| ELL | 39 | 55 | 47 | 52 | 53 | 33 | 33 | 40 | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 56 | | 80 | 73 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 46 | 48 | 44 | 51 | 43 | 19 | 38 | 80 | | |
| HSP | 59 | 59 | 53 | 63 | 64 | 40 | 42 | 65 | 82 | | |
| MUL | 50 | 53 | 50 | 60 | 56 | 44 | 32 | 69 | 93 | | |
| WHT | 61 | 59 | 50 | 73 | 62 | 43 | 60 | 69 | 86 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 48 | 44 | 56 | 55 | 41 | 39 | 55 | 76 | | |

| 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 | 17 | 37 | 35 | 28 | 31 | 18 | 13 | 27 | 61 | | |
| ELL | 20 | 42 | 59 | 37 | 48 | 24 | 19 | 29 | | | |
| ASN | 72 | 50 | | 82 | 71 | | | | 91 | | |
| BLK | 30 | 43 | 46 | 36 | 34 | 23 | 15 | 35 | 71 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 47 | 49 | 50 | 47 | 25 | 36 | 58 | 81 | | |
| MUL | 43 | 44 | 35 | 49 | 49 | 32 | 40 | 50 | 75 | | |
| WHT | 60 | 47 | 39 | 70 | 59 | 31 | 54 | 71 | 86 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 44 | 42 | 53 | 49 | 24 | 41 | 53 | 81 | | |

| 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 | 13 | 30 | 27 | 23 | 46 | 43 | 11 | 40 | 30 | | |
| ELL | 16 | 27 | 22 | 31 | 42 | 45 | 8 | 47 | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 60 | | 94 | 73 | | | | 100 | | |
| BLK | 37 | 34 | 24 | 41 | 52 | 32 | 22 | 59 | 50 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 52 | 38 | 53 | 48 | 37 | 21 | 75 | 67 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 51 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 34 | 78 | 71 | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 56 | 53 | 43 | 71 | 67 | 57 | 57 | 75 | 75 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 49 | 39 | 58 | 59 | 44 | 38 | 67 | 66 | | |

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 | 59 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 587 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| 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% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 71 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 59 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 56 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 63 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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.

Due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to the data from the 2018-2019 school year that reveals our Students with Disabilities subgroup was below 41% for the 2018-2019 school year. Although the subgroup continues to be below 41%, data shows areas of significant gains. Contributing factors could include: higher student academic, behavior, and social-emotional needs, and changes in school-based support services, resulting in process restructuring, and deliberate instructional strategies embedding WICOR. There is a trend of overall increase improvement and therefore will remain an area of deliberate focus.

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

Due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to the data from 2018-2019 that shows the greatest decline of achievement with our Lowest 25% ELL subgroup. Contributing factors include an increase of ELL students, with increased limited/no English understanding, and time taken to reestablish school-based resources.

Although this is not an area of decline, Civics remaining at 64%, requires an assessment of achievement strategies. Additional support and resources will continue to be an area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

Due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to data from 2018-2019 data that shows 8th Grade Math FSA scores (not EOC Scores) has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our school average was 32% under the state average in 2018 and remains under the state average at 26%. Contributing factors include a decline in teacher retention, and choice of instructional materials and resources. This will continue be an area of growth for the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to data from 2018-2019 that shows while the 8th Grade Math FSA data reveals the greatest gap when compared to the state average, it also indicates the greatest improvement, with an increase of 7%. A laser focus on content instruction, allocation of teacher assignment, deeper data analysis for student placement, and embedding AVID/WICOR strategies into instruction were actions contributing to increased student achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Increase social-emotional awareness among teachers and students to minimize absences and discipline.
2. Analyze and use MTSS and PBIS data to drive Tier 1- 3 instruction. Support teachers' implementation of instructional strategies for increased student achievement, increase state assessment scores, and student promotion.

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

1. Social-Emotional Learning & Mental Health Learning
2. Cross-curriculum collaboration among teachers with teacher instruction driven by data analysis
3. AVID/WICOR Strategies school-wide incorporating PBIS
4. Increasing parent engagement and involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading Plus, MAP Growth - Diagnostic 1 data in Fall 2020 Data reveals although the 8th grade school average scores increased by 7%, student scores continue to be below the 43% district average and 46% state average based on data from 2018-2019 that we need to continue to use based on COVID 19.

Measurable Outcome: 2018-2019 FSA objective outcomes
8th grade school average will continue to increase by no less than 5%, bringing it 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The math department will implement, with fidelity, AVID/WICOR strategies. Implementation of the Support Facilitation model and the scheduling of Instructional Assistants to high needs ESE classes, to support instruction and learning. Teachers will analyze student data to identify student learning needs and differentiate instruction. Continue collaboration within the department and with district resource teacher about effective achievement strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will continue to hold students accountable for being prepared for class and for their own learning. Data will support teachers' understanding of necessary strategies to enhance student content knowledge. Coaching and modeling the use of AVID/WICOR strategies will benefit all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID site coordinator will conduct WICOR strategy training through PLCs and Early Release Friday PD's
- 2.Math teachers will be trained and administer the new MAP Growth progress monitoring tool, three times this year.
3. Department lead and test coordinator will be trained to facilitate and analyze MAP Growth data, for progress monitoring.
4. Support and professional development will be provided within the department, by administration, and district resource teachers.
- 5.Teachers will receive administration or peer feedback on their instructional practices.
6. Implementation of the Support Facilitation model and the scheduling of Instructional Assistants to high needs ESE classes, to support instruction and learning.
- 7.Teachers will continue to hold students accountable for being prepared for class and for their own learning.

Person Responsible Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Develop a consistency of growth with students, with an intentional focus on the ELL and SWD subgroups, and learning gains from one year to the next. As indicated by the last 4 years of scores, growth has occurred at an inconsistent rate.

Measurable Outcome: 7th and 8th grade students will make learning gains as indicated by the scale score received on the grade level FSA. SWD subgroup will achieve a learning gain of 3% above most recent available data. The ELL subgroup will achieve learning gains up to 5% above most recent available data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roberta Scott (scott.roberta@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLCs will work with the literacy coach to review and analyze data in order to identify students with the potential to make learning gains. In addition, district resource teachers are collaborating and analyzing data with ELA and ILA teachers to enrich instructional strategies, by utilizing deliberate resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that potential for learning gains lies in aligning the task complexity to grade level standards. If tasks are aligned to standards, with text-based writing incorporated into those tasks, we believe that learning gains would increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ILA teachers will promote more independent reading
2. Literacy coach will provide all teachers with support to help teach students content literacy.
3. AVID Coordinator will develop opportunities for teachers to provide WICOR in the classroom, with a focus on reading and writing.
4. ESOL district contact, school-based contact, and instructional assistant will collaborate, review and utilize instructional-based and vocabulary building resources, and closely monitor ELL students.
5. Media Center Specialist will lead a Book Bash Team.
6. Media Center Specialist will design displays within the Media Center to highlight the award winning books that are of high interest to the students.
7. ILA and ELA teachers will collaborate to design lessons that are closely aligned to the standards in those content areas.
8. ILA and ELA teachers will collaborate with ESE service providers and case managers to collect and analyze data to provide standard-based instruction with appropriate accommodations.

Person Responsible: Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

1. Implementation of the Support Facilitation Model and the scheduling of instructional assistants to high needs ESE classes to support instruction and learning in ELA.

Person Responsible: Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data reveals two years of stagnant achievement. Student grades indicate a higher level of content understanding than assessment data reflects.

Measurable Outcome: 7th Grade Civics average will meet the 2018-2019 state average of 71%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School wide WICOR strategies across the content areas with a focus on text features and evidenced based writing. Civics teachers will collaborate with district resource teacher about effective instructional strategies, continue to implement Skills Days targeted at lower performing subgroups once a month, and analyze data to diagnose students' learning needs, inform instruction, and monitor progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The root cause of poor performance has to do with a combination of teacher expectations and knowledge of how to support all students. Coaching in the use of AVID / WICOR strategies will benefit all students. If students are learning about civics and writing about civics, proficiency scores will increase

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID site coordinator will conduct WICOR strategy training through PLC's to 7th and 8th grade social studies teachers.
2. Literacy coach will facilitate common planning with special area teams focused on incorporation of text-based writing strategies in unit plans.
3. Support provided to all teachers with instructional coach and district resource teacher to collaboratively plan Civics instruction that includes vocabulary, hands on engagement, written responses and study skills. These activities will include Skills Days once a month with students identified needing support by subgroup data.
4. Once per quarter teachers receive informal feedback on their social studies instructional practices by administration.

Person Responsible Tanza Conneely (conneely.tanza@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School Counselors and Social Worker will facilitate social-emotional student groups, provide teacher training, classroom lessons and activities, and educational events to encourage family involvement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

JMS utilizes the input from school stakeholders to improve the school culture. The administration and faculty are deliberate about building trusting and respectful relationships with students and parents. Results from the Youth Truth Survey, Insight Survey, Teacher Survey and Parent Survey guides discussion and the development of strategies and programs to positively impact our JMS academic learning and social-emotional learning environment.

Positive culture begins with a positive relationship. Over 86% of our parents reported they feel welcome at Johnson Middle School, with helpful staff addressing questions and concerns. Student mental health is priority at JMS. A student can successfully learn when their basic needs are being met. Students can then focus on learning, with minimal preoccupation. Counselors and social worker are available throughout the day; one-to-one sessions, interacting during student lunch, communicating electronically, and supporting teachers. Staff has been trained in Trauma Informed/Compassion Fatigue and the counseling department continues to monitor and support. Due to COVID-19, the format of student-centered groups are being revised. The implementation of Lion's Quest for SEL will be implemented this school year.

Our implementation of Restorative Practices helps improve relationships, trust, and reduce inappropriate behaviors. Student, parent, teacher, counselor-social worker and/or administrator are consistently in communication with students and parents for academic and social support. The results of the Youth Truth Survey indicated areas for strength and safety: 79% of students indicated the school has clear rules against hitting, pushing, tripping, etc. An area of growth is how a student responds when harassment-type behaviors are observed. Friday lessons during 3rd periods address PBIS and Restorative Practices will be implemented by teachers to address these behaviors. Increasing student safety requires an environment of trust and support which these lesson are designed to create.

As a PBIS school, the school-wide expectations (Respectful, Engaged, Prompt, Prepared, and SAFE-REPPS) are reinforced on a daily basis via announcements, classroom incentives, and school-wide rewards. PBIS serves to target areas of challenges, the data to systematically analyze and understand problem behaviors, and a way to teach and acknowledge appropriate behaviors.

The use of digital resources and social media helps build the connection between JMS and the community. As indicated in the Parent Survey, electronic communication is the best way to give and receive input with our stakeholders. Such communication engaged over 66% of our parents attended academic relevant meetings/events at JMS. The use of the FOCUS page and calendar aide in frequent communication of campus-wide activities. The JMS website and Facebook provides additional sources of community connection. A new marquee is a JMS goal and will be happening SY20-21 providing an additional source of communication with all stakeholders. We have increased communication with parents via Blackboard Connect utilizing both telephone and email outreach. Social Media and PeachJar continue to be avenues used to reach all parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |