

Brevard Public Schools

Central 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Middle School

2600 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

Demographics

Principal: Heather Smith A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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 (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Middle School

2600 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

Central Middle School will provide quality education in a culture of collaboration and learning to prepare all students to be college and career ready fostering success in a global society. (Rev Aug 2018)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Central Middle School will empower students by promoting leadership through AVID practices. (Rev Aug 2018)

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
Scheuerer, Todd	Principal	Leading the faculty and staff to maintain a safe learning environment for all. Mr. Scheuerer delegates, monitors, and collaborates with the rest of the team to ensure specific timelines are being met in regard to our instructional initiatives.
Mannes, Cole	Assistant Principal	Student services, discipline, and facilities. Mr. Mannes is leading the school through the PBIS process and works directly with students to receive input that will affect the school's decision-making process.
Zifer, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator who works directly with both students and faculty. Mrs. Zifer leads our AVID on-site meetings and has developed an AVID walk-through team to build teacher capacity at CMS. In addition, Mrs. Zifer is working alongside our math chair to help the math department integrate AVID strategies.
Thomas, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Curriculum. Mrs. Thomas is leading the way to keep faculty informed of new instructional approaches and how we will achieve the best results. She is instrumental to our BPIE process and course placements.
	Assistant Principal	Student services, discipline, and facilities. Ms. Barbara Kelly is working with the student focus groups to garner vital information from our student population.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Heather Smith A

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.*

2

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

79

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)	55%
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 (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	633	548	0	0	0	0	1181
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	79	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	161	0	0	0	0	220
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	8	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	77	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	66	0	0	0	0	178

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	110	101	0	0	0	0	211

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	14	8	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/6/2020

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	644	548	0	0	0	0	1192
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	154	0	0	0	0	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	95	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	75	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	124	0	0	0	0	241

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	191	166	0	0	0	0	357

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	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	15

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	644	548	0	0	0	0	1192
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	154	0	0	0	0	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	95	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	75	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	124	0	0	0	0	241

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	191	166	0	0	0	0	357

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	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	15

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	55%	59%	54%	58%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	55%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	47%	43%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	66%	58%	60%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	49%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	51%	37%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	52%	51%	50%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	75%	72%	73%	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	50%	58%	-8%	52%	-2%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	60%	63%	-3%	56%	4%
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	57%	62%	-5%	54%	3%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	39%	43%	-4%	46%	-7%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	48%	53%	-5%	48%	0%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	72%	74%	-2%	71%	1%
2018	71%	73%	-2%	71%	0%
Compare		1%			

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	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
2018	99%	62%	37%	62%	37%
Compare		-8%			

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

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	43	41	27	40	39	13	40	16		
ELL	33	47	44	44	49	38	21	57	75		
ASN	86	76		86	62		68	100	96		
BLK	34	47	47	35	42	37	23	64	56		
HSP	55	55	54	56	52	43	35	75	58		
MUL	50	51	50	55	47	35	58	66	77		
WHT	60	55	52	69	53	38	57	74	71		
FRL	45	51	47	50	45	34	34	65	60		

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	19	39	44	28	39	36	15	40	18		
ELL	38	60	55	45	52	48	29	67	50		
ASN	81	75		78	66		69	95	93		
BLK	37	47	47	32	45	38	33	53	71		
HSP	44	53	43	51	50	46	44	57	40		
MUL	59	47	27	58	63	67	34	74	54		
WHT	61	52	49	72	62	46	63	78	66		
FRL	46	49	43	51	50	44	41	64	42		

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	15	33	29	16	39	41	8	33			
ELL	20	38	39	33	37	35	11	52			
ASN	79	62		91	59		69	80	76		
BLK	39	40	24	35	38	25	33	61	65		
HSP	53	56	49	51	41	38	44	67	50		
MUL	59	54	47	59	49	35	58	68	79		
WHT	63	58	46	67	54	42	54	79	63		
FRL	49	50	39	48	43	35	43	64	51		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

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

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

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

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

Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
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	59
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	48
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.

Students with Disabilities (SWD)

CMS's SWD ESSA Federal Index was (31%), falling below the ESSA Federal Index (41%) requirement.

(Second consecutive year that CMS has not met the ESSA Federal Index.)

Contributing Factors:

Lack of resources, staff training and support.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile

The data shows that CMS's "Math Lowest 25th Percentile" performance decreased from 46% ('17-'18) to 39% ('18-'19). (Falling below the district & state percentiles 2-years in a row.)

Contributing Factors:

In 2018, many 8th students were transitioned to Algebra I. BPS's acceleration model may have been one contributing factor. This initiative provided students with a challenging Algebra curriculum, leaving

a higher percentage of struggling math students in FSA tested classes.

Science Achievement

CMS 8th science comparison data demonstrated that CMS matched the state science achievement (48%) and was below the district science achievement percentile (53%). (That was the second consecutive year CMS has declined in science achievement.)

Contributing Factors:

During 2019, CMS was unable to hire an 8th grade science teacher.

Math Learning Gains

CMS Math learning gain achievement (51%) is below district (45%) & state (57%).

Contributing Factors:

Lack of progress monitoring, reflection, inconsistent inclusive practices have led to students performing below grade level.

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

There were two main areas of decline. First, the lowest 25th percentile in Math decreased from 46% to 39%, which is a 7% decline. Contributing factors from 2019 include personnel changes, no intensive math class, lack of vertical alignment to middle school from previous math class.

The second area of decline was science - the proficiency level went from 52% to 48%, which is a 4% decline. More specifically by subgroup, BLK decreased by 10%, HSP decreased by 9%, ELL decreased by 7%, and FRL decreased by 7%. Contributing factors from 2019 include losing (and unable to replace) an 8th grade science teacher during the 1st quarter, and lack of review of 6th and 7th grade standards on a consistent basis.

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.

Eight grade math proficiency is 7% below the state average, school-wide math lowest 25th percentile is 39% proficiency compared to the state proficiency of 51%

A variety of factors could have contributed to these discrepancies. For example personnel changes, inconsistent inclusive practices, no intensive math classes, lack of prescribed progress monitoring tool, (in 2020 we implemented a MAPS program), and a lack of vertical alignment when students transition to middle school.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was ELA lowest 25%. The data demonstrated a 7% increase from 2018, 45% to 52%.

Several new actions were implemented in the 2018-19 school year. Reading Plus progress monitoring was implemented school-wide and data was discussed and monitored. Goal-setting was implemented for students and supported by the Literacy Coach. The literacy coach worked with all MESH teachers to support comprehension and AVID strategies. The ESE push-in teacher for ELA demonstrated an effective model that promoted co-teaching and collaborative planning with the general education teacher.

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

Two potential areas of concern are 175 identified students with Attendance below 90 percent and 211 students with two or more indicators. Another area of concern is 354 students earning a Level 1 on at least one statewide assessment.

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

1. Number of consecutive years Students with Disabilities subgroup below 32% for 2.
2. Science achievement for SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP
3. Math Achievement for the lowest 25th
4. Disproportionality of SWD and BLK students with OSS/ISS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This subgroup was identified as a top priority due to its 31% achievement rate for two years straight. This area needs to be above 32% to achieve the desired learning level for SWDs.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2020-2021 school year at Central Middle School, we will achieve a level of 37% achievement for our SWDs. We understand that eLearning may provide hurdles that we will work to overcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Thomas (thomas.jessicar@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Central Middle school will use WICOR strategies as we build on our AVID program to promote organization and varied learning techniques. Teachers will receive AVID training on-site for professional development in order to further support our SWD population.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: WICOR is AVID's proven learning support structure that incorporates teaching and learning methods in critical areas to help students comprehend and present ideas at higher levels of understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continuation of BPIE strategy. Helping students understand their IEPs and the process to advocate self advocacy. With COVID restraints, incorporate a virtual aspect.
2. Utilization of the schoolwide AVID binder to help organize student information.
3. Teachers will continue focused note-taking in the classroom to stress schoolwide organization. This will help our SWD population since they will master one style of note-taking that will work for all classes.
4. PLCs to analyze SWD data to make instructional decisions.
5. Construct a list of SWD eLearners to offer additional support.
6. ESE teacher push-in and IA trainings for collaboration--on-site
7. After school online math tutoring invites for SWD eLearners--will use CARES act money
8. Teachers will use AVID and WICOR in the classroom
9. AVID walk-through team will randomly observe teachers to encourage AVID strategy utilization on a regular basis--discuss weekly implementation at PLCs.
10. Focus group of ESE students

Person Responsible: Jessica Thomas (thomas.jessicar@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Disporportionality of OSS/ISS with SWDs and African-American students. This impacts student learning due to loss of instructional time, campus time, and building positive relationships. This was identified as a need due to the the 2.27 ratio for African-American students and 1.79 for ESE students.
Measurable Outcome:	CMS will improve the risk ratios of 2.27 (African-American) and 1.79 (ESE) to 1.00. Entering our introductory year as a PBIS school, we will reduce this year's ratio to 1.50 and 1.25, respectively, with the goal of reducing those to 1.00 the following year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cole Mannes (mannes.cole@brevardschools.org) In order to make the jump needed to reach our goal, we will incorporate several new stragies:
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop a PBIS team and attend PBIS trainings Offer AVID cultural development PD Implement Check and Connect mentoring program Manage restorative practices between suspended students and teachers Organize student focus groups (African-American, ESE, Whole Group)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Central Middle School has a high suspension rate for African-American and ESE students. By attacking this problem with multiple evidence-based strategies, we will ensure the sense of urgency this merits is met. PBIS has well-documented results, and we will take a large group to be trained to garner school-wide buy-in. Building better teacher/student relationships will improve morale and decrease suspensions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Become a PBIS school through vigorous training. We will exceed the minimum number of teachers we send for training to achieve even more of a grassroots movement.
2. AVID coordinator will develop and lead AVID cultural development through Professional Development.
3. On-site counselor as part of CCI 2 days a week. Our "Check and Connect" counselor will provide mentorship and problem-solving strategies on Mondays and Wednesdays.
4. IA to observe Check and Connect students in class and track data
5. Admin will meet with student focus groups each semester to provide crucial perspective from our most vital stakeholder.
6. Dean will lead restorative practices for suspended students and teachers.
7. Guidance/Deans collaborative meetings bi-monthly to identify students who need extra support to avoid getting stuck in the perpetual referral cycle.
8. Run a weekly report comparing suspension days with attendance records to ensure suspension data is being accurately recorded and to identify target students.

Person Responsible Cole Mannes (mannes.cole@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 48% of all students passed the Science FSA in 2019, which was a 5% discrepancy from the year before. Only 13% of SWD students showed achievement. While eLearning will provide challenges, we will rebound back to 53% this year and improve our SWD achievement percentage to 16%.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year at Central Middle School, 25% of students on cusp of making a learning gain (bubble kids), will show positive growth on the science FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Thomas (thomas.jessicar@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. AVID/WICOR strategies
2. Science interventions with data based feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: BY improving performance in weak content areas, students will better develop the foundational skills necessary for growth. Using inquiry based lessons, students who struggled with content in more traditional settings have opportunity to master the skills. Differentiating instruction offers the opportunity to satisfy student needs. Evidence used includes analysis of the state, district and school wide performances on individual strands of the Science FSSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin will identify bubble students using past scores of borderline 2/3.
2. Science teachers will meet in PLCs to plan implementation of in class skills day.
3. Implement AVID strategies (will be reviewed and monitored throughout the year) to encourage organization in all science classes.
4. Review student samples of WICOR strategies in science department PLCs.
5. Support SWD students in science in a regular education setting by utilizing ASD home-based model.
6. Progress monitor using Skills Day assessments and using the data to plan remediation
7. Admin and science teacher walk-throughs to provide data to improve best practices.
8. Review standards during science PLCs. This will be led by science chair.

Person Responsible Jessica Thomas (thomas.jessicar@brevardschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Only 27% of Central's SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup demonstrated proficiency on the end-of-year math assessment. Our "Lowest 25%" missed the statewide average of students demonstrating proficiency by 12% and fell short of the district average by 6%. Overall, our students struggled to show math learning gains; only 51% showed learning gains, which is 4% short of the district average and 6% short of the state average. For the past two years, students in our SWD subgroup performed below the 32% Federal Index expectation. In 2018-19, 0 students with disabilities were enrolled in Algebra 1.

Measurable Outcome: 35% of our students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency on the end-of-year math assessment. 55% of our students school-wide will show learning gains on FSA math. We will have added 15 acceleration points to our overall score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Zifer (zifer.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Focused note-taking (AVID / WICOR)
 Organization instruction (AVID / WICOR)
 Student placement in advanced math classes
 Peer (teacher) modeling / observation
 Additional support via online tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: WICOR is AVID's proven learning support structure that incorporates teaching and learning methods in critical areas to help students comprehend and present ideas at higher levels of understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin will enroll all 7th graders in Math 2 Advanced or higher
2. Admin will analyze data to place students in Algebra 1
3. Utilize schoolwide AVID binder to organize math materials/notes
4. Math teachers will use focused note-taking strategies in math class (modeled to them by AVID coordinator)
5. Math PLC analyzes student samples of focused note-taking strategies
6. Implement progress monitoring using MAPS to adjust future PD and potential class placement
7. Continue implementing ASD "Home Base" model to support students in a regular education setting
8. ESE resource teacher will push-in to 8th grade math classes to offer support to SWD in their math class
10. Additional support offered to all students via online tutoring. With COVID, this will help us reach our eLearners as well to ensure they are receiving adequate support
11. Teachers will model lessons using effective strategies for their peers
12. Learning strategies teacher will incorporate foundational math skill lessons into their classes
13. BPIE team will meet monthly to problem solve, facilitate two stakeholder input round table sessions, and make adjustments based on this input and problem solving. Problem solving will emphasize SWD achievement and goal-setting, giving everyone more of a voice in educational planning. Will do this virtually for eLearners.
14. Administration observing math instruction and giving regular feedback.

Person Responsible Jennifer Zifer (zifer.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

Gathering feedback from all stakeholders is imperative to all schools, but this is especially true for the largest middle school in the county. To this point, the administrative team has built up a positive school culture by having clear expectations, being uniform in interpretations of those expectations, transparency with staff, and an open-door policy. We have recently contributed even more to our positive school culture by empowering more of our faculty, which is building capacity across the campus.

We are becoming a PBIS school this year, and we started by doubling the number of members suggested by the district to include nine teachers, a guidance counselor, and an administrator. Administration is there to provide information to the team, but the teachers will be making key decisions in the process to develop ownership. By giving the faculty the decision-making power, CMS will garner the buy-in by our faculty needed to achieve an even better school culture.

Last year, administration held a day of student focus groups in an effort to understand why our risk ratios were skewed. Because of the success we found with these groups, we will continue the focus groups and include different groups to gain insight to different issues. This will give our student body voice and influence on school policies.

Our parent survey last year was our main method of communication with our parental stakeholders. This gave parents an opportunity to voice their concerns and offer suggestions to improve our school. While this survey affected the entire parent population, we focused on our SWD population by inviting parents to the school to learn about the IEP process with their children. We received excellent feedback on this process and are working on ways to achieve the same success with COVID restraints.

In order to accommodate and hear our various stakeholders, we analyzed results from three surveys: Youth Truth, Insight, and Parent. Here are our main takeaways:

Youth Truth: (These results ran negative)

Growth Areas: Not feeling part of the school community

Strengths: Feeling safe at school

One of the initiatives of our 8th grade Eagle team last year was the development of more clubs. We have

experienced a setback with this due to COVID. eLearning will present another challenge in creating community, but teachers/admin have been sharing pedagogy to address this.

Insight:

Growth Areas: Leadership – failure to seek out feedback from teachers, effective instructional leadership, modeling behavior.

Strengths: Identified opportunities for teacher leadership roles, and in the past six months teachers have practiced teaching techniques with peer or instructional expert outside of their own classroom

We have approached our instructional approach with the village mentality this year to gain as much knowledge on effective eLearning as possible. Administrations open-door policy is being emphasized.

Parent:

Growth Areas: Lack of electives, and communication with parents consistently from teachers

Strengths: Parents feel welcome on campus

We will include an additional AVID elective next semester. In addition, we will have multiple teachers continue/take on content-area electives (Science Research, Critical Thinking).

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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