
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

John F. Kennedy Middle School

2100 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Peter Papczynski A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

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)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

John F. Kennedy Middle School

2100 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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>41%</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>39%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

John F. Kennedy Middle School is committed to achieving an educational standard of excellence for all students that will motivate and empower students to become lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The John. F. Kennedy Middle School community shares a commitment to education that challenges and motivates students to reach their highest potential.

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
Tomlinson, Sherry	Principal	
Davis, Tami	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Peter Papczynski 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.*

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	290	369	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	68	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	39	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	31	0	0	0	0	70

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	5	14	0	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/14/2020

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	375	283	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	40	0	0	0	0	81

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	13	11	0	0	0	0	24

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

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	375	283	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	40	0	0	0	0	81

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	13	11	0	0	0	0	24

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	59%	54%	69%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	54%	62%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	47%	47%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	75%	66%	58%	85%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	55%	57%	74%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	51%	69%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	58%	52%	51%	64%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	75%	72%	77%	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	63%	58%	5%	52%	11%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	68%	63%	5%	56%	12%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	66%	62%	4%	54%	12%
	2018	67%	62%	5%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	59%	43%	16%	46%	13%
	2018	64%	41%	23%	45%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	53%	3%	48%	8%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	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	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
2018	71%	73%	-2%	71%	0%
Compare		6%			
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	99%	61%	38%	61%	38%
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
Compare		1%			
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	19	43	39	25	54	60	13	30			
ELL	31	50		54	71						
ASN	80	83		100	67				100		
BLK	29	44	34	48	63	56	21	52	64		
HSP	63	58	26	69	65	58	55	65	80		
MUL	66	50		80	59	46	58	79	86		
WHT	73	60	54	80	62	53	66	82	81		
FRL	51	56	46	60	61	54	43	64	70		

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	20	34	25	27	46	36	24	22			
ELL	33	25		75	54						
ASN	75	55		100	100				85		
BLK	29	37	30	44	49	35	21	37	38		
HSP	62	47	43	77	70	54	57	67	56		
MUL	63	47	33	71	62	50	55	65	82		
WHT	71	56	37	84	77	64	69	80	77		
FRL	47	43	32	63	62	45	44	55	51		
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	21	44	39	38	49	38	24	24			
ASN	79	80		93	80				90		
BLK	42	54	50	62	70	65	36	54	50		
HSP	65	51	50	87	77	78	57	85	53		
MUL	69	66	45	80	61	43	71	81	74		
WHT	76	66	45	90	76	73	70	80	75		
FRL	48	50	44	69	67	66	40	58	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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	52
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	86
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	46
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	60
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	66
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	68
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	56
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.

The ESE subgroup. While the students with disabilities showed improvement in ELA learning gains they are still achieving significantly lower than their peers. This group historically has had limited opportunities to work with rigorous curriculum on grade level. Low expectations yielded low performance.

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

The African American subgroup previously showed a 4.1% decrease in ELA learning gains. The subgroup was 37% African Americans with disabilities and 75% African Americans with FRL. Those factors have contributed to the challenges faced by this group of students.

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.

Kennedy scored the same or higher in all subject areas when compared to the state averages on the most recent assessments. This is primarily due to improvements in most academic areas. For the last assessment, there was a decrease in performance in the area of Science, the decrease was still not large enough to be below the state average. A continuing cycle of improvement will continue to be a goal.

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

Improved performance in the area of math learning gains for African Americans has shown our most significant increase. Restructured classes to be inclusive with support facilitation. Provided common planning for academic teachers. Added significant academic support. Implemented IXL for support of grade level standards to regularly monitor the progress of our most struggling students.

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

Kennedy's greatest area of concern is the achievement gap that exists for students with disabilities. Another is having our African American subgroup improve learning gains at a comparable rate to other subgroups.

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

1. Improving student achievement for students with disabilities.
2. Improving student achievement for the African American subgroup.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ensure higher percentage of access to advanced courses for African Americans Research shows racial differences in educational access and academic achievement (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2017; Office of Civil Rights, 2016). Low-income, African-American and Hispanic students continue to face significant disparities in access to quality educational opportunities and resources at the K-12 level – including access to services critical for college success, new data from the U.S. Department of Education show. Black high school students are significantly underrepresented in AP courses that provide students with a jumpstart on college and serve as an early predictor of college success, according to The College Board’s “Advanced Placement Report to the Nation.” Experts say checking teacher bias and improving identification of qualified Black students can help. “The evidence is clear. The single greatest predictor of college success is success in rigorous high school courses,” says Daria Hall, K-12 policy director for The Education Trust.

Measurable Outcome: There will be an increase in the number of African American students enrolled in rigorous courses. We will have 10% or more of the African American subgroup enrolled in Algebra Honors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherry Tomlinson (tomlinson.sherry@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence in “Closing the Divide,” Robert Dreeben (1987) shows the level of learning responds strongly to the quality of instruction: having and using enough time, covering a substantial amount of rich curriculum, matching instruction appropriately to the ability levels...When black and white children of comparable ability experience the same instruction, they do about equally well, and this is true when the instruction is excellent in quality and when it is inadequate (p. 34). When students of similar backgrounds and initial achievement levels are exposed to more and less challenging curriculum material, those given the richer curriculum opportunities outperform those placed in less challenging classes (Alexander & McDill, 1976; Oakes, 1985; Gamoran & Behrends, 1987).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Previously only 8.2% of our African American population was enrolled in Algebra Honors. While this was an improvement over the .09% the year prior, we need to do better.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Accurately place students in advanced courses
2. Conference with principals and school counselors to explain and review minority placement data.
3. Encourage working with teachers to recommend minority placement in advanced courses.
4. Explain Avid program (invite resource teacher) and remind about interviewing dates. Share LRE% data and explain about support facilitation and the need to have feeder schools prepare their students with disabilities appropriately for exposure to on grade level assignments

Person Responsible Sherry Tomlinson (tomlinson.sherry@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Ensure greater level of support of minority students in advanced courses
 Underrepresented minorities are likely to find themselves academically and socially isolated, (Nettles 1988; Treisman 1992; Cole and Barber 2003). This sense of isolation can result in a lack of a support structure and reinforcement. Fostering contact with faculty outside of the classroom through both formal mentoring and informal interactions can be helpful in decreasing this isolation. Similarly, building a critical mass of student peers can enhance the social support system as well as student persistence and success (Allen, 1992; Fries-Britt, 2000; Gándara and Maxwell-Jolly, 1999; McHenry, 1997).
 Students who come from economically and culturally disadvantaged backgrounds find themselves in intimidating situations, and without the same level of information or access to information that students from advantaged situations have. Even if students are prepared and interested, they may be intimidated. This apprehension may create barriers to entry or create barriers to the information needed to be fully successful.

Measurable Outcome:

Kennedy will provide support facilitation in Math and ELA. Extra support will be provided to students with disabilities in the form of support facilitation and the critical thinking elective. More minority students will be recruited and selected for AVID to provide extra support for rigorous academics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Research indicate that Black students whose teachers communicated high expectations had higher SAT-10 math scores (Woolley et al., 2010). This serves as promising evidence for setting high expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

All students need supplementary support as they transition to the rigor of advanced courses. Schools can offer support for students through preparatory classes, summer sessions, after school sessions, or additional instructional time. The National Governors Association notes that tight alignment of the regular and advanced curricula can prepare students for the rigor of advanced coursework. In addition to academic support, high-achieving low-income and minority students may require additional psychosocial support to combat stereotypes and build confidence.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Make connection at feeder schools with targeted students and interview them/recruit them for AVID along with a minority teacher.
2. Principal waive requirements such as teacher recommendations/parent documentation for enrollment into Advanced classes with AVID for support.
3. Once test scores arrive, double check for more qualifying students and then send congratulatory letters to all who will be scheduled

Person Responsible

Sherry Tomlinson (tomlinson.sherry@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ensure greater level of support for ESE students to ensure on grade level work. Simply removing the barriers that have been erected against access to high level courses in and of itself is not sufficient to improve readiness and performance. Students from low-income and minority backgrounds too often have academic and social deficits and need a set of academic and social support mechanisms to help them navigate the challenges of rigorous courses and gain access to the same opportunities.

Measurable Outcome: There should be a minimum of 3% increase in the number of ESE students making learning gains and scoring level three or above on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthening the rigor of courses taken in middle and high schools can be an effective strategy to raise student achievement levels, and ensure post secondary and work readiness for more students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Help teachers design high-quality work and teach in ways that engage students, cause them to persist, and result in student satisfaction and acquisition of knowledge, critical-thinking, and problem-solving skills. Help teachers use a variety of instructional strategies and settings that identify and accommodate individual learning needs and engage students. Make sure that each student has a personal plan for progress that is reviewed often and ensures that students are engaged in an effort to meet high standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule Team Teaching training for ESE as well as GEN ED teachers in planning for new school year.
2. Hire/change course assignments on teachers to ensure ESE support is at greatest extent for ESE students based on individual needs of admitted students.
3. Increase support facilitation
4. Principal enter Support Facilitation schedule and S916 requests for ESE students. Ensure BGL ESE students have either AVID or Learning Strategies (dependent on need) and ILA for added interventions.

Person Responsible: Sherry Tomlinson (tomlinson.sherry@brevardschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide necessary professional development relative to access/support of academic success for minority and ESE subgroups Collaboration alone does not automatically translate into enhanced student performance of course, but it greatly enhances a school's ability to adopt an approach to instructional procedures that better serve all students, including students with disabilities. Administrators, teachers, and staff are more productive and more highly motivated when a school's environment is imbued with a sense of collaboration (Birenbaum, Kimron, & Shilton, 2011; Bush & Glover, 2012; Kennedy, Deuel, Nelson, & Slavit, 2011).
Measurable Outcome:	PD will be provided on culturally relevant teaching and high yield instructional strategies for subgroups. There will be PROGo records, meeting agendas, and presentations that reflect a minimum of three PD experiences for staff.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A well-designed teacher development process is essential for measurable and lasting learning. Teachers need to know what students are doing well and where to focus their attention. Using formative assessments, teachers can pinpoint where students have gaps and intervene accordingly. Researchers have also found that school achievement is much stronger where teachers work in collaborative teams that plan and learn together. Teachers repeatedly confirm that opportunities to work with their colleagues often determine where they are willing to work. Collaboration, however, requires time as well as will, and this means that school staffing and schedules must be designed differently. Evidence supports the need for collaboration. Teachers will be provided subject area common planning time. Teachers will work through subgroup data and receive training in using a variety of progress monitoring tools. Subject area resource teachers will provide additional support to classroom teachers and support facilitators.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Researchers have consistently found that teacher effectiveness is the critical component in improving student achievement, but the question has always been, "How do we make sure they are effective?" AUSL is a huge believer in focused professional development to improve teacher effectiveness. Research suggests that direct, explicit instruction effectively improves the math and reading achievement of struggling students, including those with special needs or who are English language learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure new hires participate in all available professional development beginning with summer months inclusive of New Teacher Academy here at KMS.
2. Scheduling of resource teachers to support and ensure alignment with use of resources and curriculum and guides from BPS.

Person Responsible Tami Davis (davis.tami@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.

To evaluate Kennedy's culture we examined three important groups of stakeholders: parents, students, and staff.

At Kennedy the majority of our parents, 87.76%, according to our annual Parent Survey, prefer email as means of communicating with the school. Only 37.76% opt for FOCUS as a communication tool. As we reflect on our ability to connect with parents, survey results indicate more than 20% report communicating with teachers weekly. Another 43.53% report communicating more than once per year with their student's teachers. Even though FOCUS was not the first choice for preferred communication, 49.1% report that they access information weekly on FOCUS. More than 20% report accessing FOCUS daily. The most effective tool for family engagement was academic support according to 65% of our parents. We have expanded our Academic Support program to include virtual tutoring to provide an additional avenue of support for our students. We now provide face to face tutoring every day of the week and have added virtual tutoring that even includes weekend options for academic support. We have made effective parent communication the topic of professional development and will continue to have teachers with positive communication skills model and mentor their peers as needed.

When we examined student perceptions in the Youth Truth Survey we found the areas students reported the highest levels of satisfaction were culture and academic rigor. Areas with the lowest ratings were engagement and relationships. Students were satisfied with discipline and reported that both teachers and discipline was fair. A large percentage, 61%, report that they believe they have at least one adult on campus that would help them with a personal problem. The lowest rated response was the belief that most students treat adults with respect. This was important to us to address, if students found teachers supportive and fair it clearly left them troubled that teachers would be treated disrespectfully.

Insight survey results provided data related to teacher satisfaction and areas we needed to provide focus and support. The domain identified as having the greatest need for improvement was Learning Environment, specifically the interactions between students and adults. This was consistent as the feedback from students indicated the same need.

To best address the identified need, we met in small groups to identify what respectful behavior would look like in different areas across our campus. Then we evaluated the lists of behaviors whole group to reach a consensus. Next we designed expectation posters that defined the respectful expectation is easy to understand student language. Then we ordered posters from the print shop and displayed them all across our campus.

We have added signage with examples and explanation of P-R-I-D-E to build on the momentum of a school wide culture initiative to reinforce positive Kennedy values campus wide.

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: ESSA Subgroup: African-American							\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			1101 - John F. Kennedy Middle School	Other			\$0.00
2 III.A. Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American							\$7,018.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1101 - John F. Kennedy Middle School	Other			\$7,018.00
3 III.A. Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities							\$10,535.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1101 - John F. Kennedy Middle School	Other			\$10,535.00
4 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning							\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	6300	239-Other	1101 - John F. Kennedy Middle School	Other			\$0.00
Total:							\$17,553.00