Andrew Jackson Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Andrew Jackson Middle School

1515 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Shockley M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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)	95%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Andrew Jackson Middle School

1515 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.jackson.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	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

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.

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to providing our students with an environment where students feel supported, think critically, and make informed decisions as lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to quality education that challenges and motivates our students to reach their highest potential by being STAR Generals (Stay Safe, Take Responsibility, Achieve Academic Excellence, Respect Yourself and Others.)

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
Susin, Tina	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, SAC committee and community members to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.
Shockley, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, SAC committee and community members to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.
Donohue, Christina	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, SAC committee and community members to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/1/2017, Susan Shockley M

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.*
1

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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)	95%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	297	260	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	51	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	26	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	47	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	40	0	0	0	0	123
Learning Loss during Distance Learning (excessive absences and ELA/Math Failure)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	0	0	0	0	29

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	46	29	0	0	0	0	75

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

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	268	270	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	60	0	0	0	0	121

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	15	24	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	17

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	268	270	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	60	0	0	0	0	121

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	15	24	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	17

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	60%	59%	54%	62%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	54%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	49%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	66%	58%	64%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	55%	57%	64%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	51%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	52%	51%	62%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	75%	72%	85%	76%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	58%	58%	0%	52%	6%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	62%	63%	-1%	56%	6%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	64%	62%	2%	54%	10%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	54%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	33%	43%	-10%	46%	-13%
	2018	36%	41%	-5%	45%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	49%	53%	-4%	48%	1%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	74%	73%	1%	71%	3%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Compare		21%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	96%	60%	36%	56%	40%
Compare		4%			

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	26	48	42	28	44	33	22	51			
ASN	83	58		92	75				100		
BLK	35	43	44	44	50	38	20	56	58		
HSP	48	60	53	63	55	38	42	71	84		
MUL	61	56	50	70	60	33	42	87	100		
WHT	71	67	51	77	65	52	65	85	87		
FRL	49	55	46	58	56	41	35	74	75		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	36	28	25	45	35	21	44			
ELL					40						
BLK	37	43	26	39	50	37	24	65	57		
HSP	52	57	58	57	53	25	42	65	53		
MUL	63	57	60	53	61	43	55	74	69		
WHT	70	57	56	69	55	45	67	83	74		
FRL	52	51	42	50	49	39	41	70	56		

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	42	41	23	44	43	14	55			
ASN	73	82		82	91						
BLK	41	51	42	46	57	42	36	78	77		
HSP	49	59	44	59	59	53	50	81	79		
MUL	65	71	45	63	59		60	87	76		
WHT	72	67	55	72	68	58	74	89	79		
FRL	52	57	44	55	58	47	52	80	68		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	62
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	69
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	54
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 lowest performance at Jackson Middle School is our SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup.The 2018-2019 Federal Index for our SWD was 38 which is below the threshold of 41% for TS&I (Targeted Support and Intervention.) Unfortunately this appears to be a trend for us. During the 2019-2020 school year, 88% of our current 7th grade students performed below grade level on the iReady Reading assessment. Also during the 2019-2020 school year, 65% of our current 8th grade students scored below grade level for reading proficiency on the Reading Plus Benchmark assessment. At the start of the 2020-2021 school year on our first Reading Plus Benchmark assessment, 78 of 85 (92%) SWD were below grade level for reading proficiency. One contributing factor was distance learning during the 4th quarter of the 2019-2020 school year due to Covid-19. During this time frame, we had 29 students that suffered a learning loss as defined by an attendance rate less than 90% and a failure in an ELA or math course.

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

In 2019, 60% of our students demonstrated proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment. During the 2019-2020 school year, only 45% of our students demonstrated proficiency on the iReady Reading assessment or Reading Plus benchmark assessment. At the start of the 2020-2021 school year, only 41% of our students demonstrated proficiency on the Reading Plus Benchmark assessment. Again, one contributing factor was distance learning during the 4th quarter of the 2019-2020 school year due to Covid-19. During this time frame, we had 144 students that were considered as disengaged learners for two or more of their classes.

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.

Based on 2019 state assessment data, the largest gap when compared to the state average was in Math learning gains with the lowest 25% of our students. The state had 51% of the lowest 25% of students achieve learning gains while Jackson only had 43% of the lowest 25% of the students achieve learning gains. For the 2019-2020 school year, 45% of Jackson students demonstrated proficiency on the iReady Reading assessment or the Reading Plus benchmark assessment as compared to the 2019 state average of 54% proficient. One factor that contributed to this gap in math and ELA achievement was having large numbers of SWD in our general education classes due to limited support facilitation teachers.

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

Based on 2019 state assessment data, the area that showed the most improvement was in Math achievement. In 2018, Jackson had 61% of our students that scored a Level 3 or higher on the Math FSA. In 2019, Jackson had 69% of our students that scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA. For the 2019-2020 school year, both the 7th grade and the 8th grade students had an increase in their mean RIT score on the MAP Growth progress monitoring from the Fall to the Winter administration. The 7th graders increased from a mean RIT score of 219.9 to 220.7 and the 8th graders increased from 227.5 to 230.5. For the 2019-2020 school year, we implemented a math pull-out remediation program. Students who needed remediation in math were pulled out of an elective class weekly to work with a certified math teacher to receive math support.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is our number of students with two or more EWS indicators. For 2019-2020 we had 39 students with two or more indicators. For this year 2020-2021, that number increased to 75 students with two or more EWS indicators.

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

1. Increasing the Federal Index for our SWD subgroup
2. Increasing Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in Math
3. Increasing Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in ELA
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research based instructional practices will be utilized to increase student achievement specifically relating to our students with disabilities. FSA data used to calculate the Federal Index for our SWD, iReady Reading scores, and Reading Plus Benchmark scores all indicate that our SWD are performing below grade level in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	For the second Reading Plus Benchmark assessment, the number of SWD performing below grade level will decrease from 92% to 82%. By the third Reading Plus Benchmark assessment, that number will decrease to 72%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will be focused on the MTSS problem solving framework. ESE student work samples will be reviewed and common assessment data will be analyzed by the General Education teacher and the ESE teacher. A plan of action will be collaboratively developed for ESE students who are not mastering standards for re-teaching and re-assessing. Tier 2 interventions will be discussed, implemented and monitored for success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be supported in their Professional Learning Communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning. PLCs utilize both Teacher Estimates of Students Achievement with an effect size of 1.62 and Collective Teacher Efficacy with an effect size of 1.57 (J. Hattie, December 2017 visiblelearningplus.com).

Action Steps to Implement

Establish Schedule and Expectations for PLCs
-Admin will create calendar for PLCs to meet 3 times a month
-Admin will review expectations of the PLCs with the department chairs during Pre-Planning
-Department Chairs will review expectations with Gen Ed and ESE teachers
-PLCs will continue to collaborate on increasing Teacher Clarity in the classroom
-Teachers will post daily Learning Goals, Learning Experiences, and Success Criteria and ESE support (teachers and IA's) will conduct daily checks for understanding

Person Responsible	Tina Susin (susin.tina@brevardschools.org)

Analyze Student Work Samples
-Once a quarter, teachers will decide on a common standards-based task for progress monitoring
-Teachers will collect student work to bring to PLC
-Teachers will analyze and sort student work based on established criteria
-Teachers will analyze trends, adjust instructional practices and create next steps for implementation

Person Responsible	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

CARES Act and Academic Support Funds
-ESE students will be identified and encouraged to attend before/after school tutoring sessions
-SWD will be monitored by ESE case worker to determine progress toward IEP goals

Person Responsible	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Addressing the needs of students that are at risk of dropping out of school will increase their academic achievement. When barriers to success like poor attendance, course failures, and discipline issues are improved, academic performance should increase. This is a critical need for Jackson Middle School because we went from 39 students with two or more Early Warning System indicators for 2019-2020 to having 75 students with two or more indicators at the start of the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	At the beginning of second semester for the 2020-2021 school year, the number of students with two or more EWS indicators will decrease from 75 to 50.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	From the Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools report published by the US Department of Education in 2017, one recommendation is to monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected to monitor the progress and analyze the data for our students at risk. By implementing interventions we should see an increase in student achievement. Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29 (J. Hattie, December 2017 visiblelearnngplus.com).

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze Early Warning System Indicators
-Department Chairs will learn Dept Meeting protocols and lead meetings while following MTSS protocols
-Teachers will attend professional development on MTSS
-Teachers will identify struggling students, implement strategies and interventions and progress monitor
- Teachers will identify students with two or more EWS indicators
-Teachers will refer these students to the Student Success Team
-Student Success Team will begin IPST process
-Student Success Team will design specific interventions for individual students
-Teachers will monitor progress and collect data

Person Responsible	Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Progress Monitoring of At-Risk Students
-Department PLCs will monitor the progress of students on common assessments
-Reading Plus and MAP Growth progress monitoring will be administered three times a year to monitor Reading and Math progress
-Interventions for each student will be reviewed with parents and teachers quarterly to determine if effective or if modifications are needed

Person Responsible	Christina Donohue (donohue.christina@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To improve learning gains for our lowest 25% in Math, we will be using IXL to provide math remediation twice a week for our students. Students will be pulled out of an elective course twice a week to work with a certified math teacher on math weaknesses as identified by common assessment data and MAP Growth progress monitoring.

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.

Jackson Middle School works to build a positive school culture and environment by creating a welcoming environment for parents and families. In the 2019-2020 Parent Survey, 86% of parents responded that they feel welcome at AJMS and 66% of parents responded that the office staff at AJMS is always polite and helpful in answering questions or concerns. However, 29% of parents claim they never hear from teachers regarding their child's progress and 38% are never provided information about ways to help their child's progress. Our goal is to increase parent participation in the use of Focus and also to create parent resource pages on our website.

Jackson Middle School is a PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) school. We consistently teach and model positive behaviors on campus. We also build a positive environment on campus by implementing Restorative Practices. The assistant principal or social worker facilitate restorative conversations between students and teachers or between students to repair relationships that may have been damaged due to a behavioral incident or conflict. However, according to the YouthTruth survey, our students believe their peers do not respect the adults on this campus therefore we are going to focus on building positive teacher/student relationships.

This year with the re-opening of schools after closing for Covid-19 we are implementing SEL recovery lessons during homeroom. These lessons provide students with opportunities to identify and explore their emotions, manage stress, and overcome obstacles.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.