Thomas Jefferson Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thomas Jefferson Middle School

1275 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

Demographics

Principal: Meara Trine J

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)	45%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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

Thomas Jefferson Middle School

1275 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.jefferson.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	45%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

Thomas Jefferson Middle School's mission is to ensure that every student achieves at their maximum potential in an engaging and challenging learning environment in order to become productive citizens in today's society. (2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Academic and interpersonal success for all students (2019)

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
Trine, Meara	Principal	*Assist all school "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions *Attend all PLC meetings for all departments to assist with developing and implementing targeted interventions for at-risk students *Review progress of SIP and give updates to SAC members at meetings *Review data quarterly to determine student needs for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions *Work with ESE team to ensure that all student's IEP needs are being met
Koch, Lena	Assistant Principal	*Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions *Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students *Review progress of SIP and give updates to the SAC members at meetings *Review data quarterly to determine student needs for Tier 2 intervention
Johnson, Christina	Instructional Coach	-Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 1 and Tier 2 Reading interventions -Assists English Language Arts and Reading departments in developing and implementing interventions for their at-risk students -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students
Yates, Nancy	School Counselor	-Organize and run targeted small groups to address specific social-emotional learning targets -Assist all school academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and 3 interventions -Assisting all school academic "teams" in finding workable solutions for the challenges faced by ESE students in the general education classroom -Work directly with Support Facilitators to ensure that all student's IEP needs are being met -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to assist with developing and implementing targeted interventions for ESE students

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/14/2020, Meara Trine J

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

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)	45%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	318	349	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	79	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	45	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	42	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	29	0	0	0	0	84

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	67	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	342	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	65	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	40	0	0	0	0	73

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	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	351	342	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	65	0	0	0	0	115

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	33	40	0	0	0	0	73

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	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	63%	59%	54%	66%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	54%	66%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	58%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	66%	58%	70%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	63%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	45%	51%	41%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	52%	51%	62%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	75%	72%	81%	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	57%	58%	-1%	52%	5%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	69%	63%	6%	56%	13%
	2018	73%	65%	8%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	60%	62%	-2%	54%	6%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	39%	43%	-4%	46%	-7%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	60%	53%	7%	48%	12%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	80%	73%	7%	71%	9%
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	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	60%	37%	57%	40%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

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	25	42	36	36	37	36	20	47	60		
ELL	41	56	50	63	61						
ASN	59	67		82	53				83		
BLK	30	40	25	33	32	33	33	69			
HSP	58	50	52	63	46	50	52	69	81		
MUL	68	57	64	73	51	30	65	83	91		
WHT	66	59	49	76	52	50	63	79	87		
FRL	50	51	45	59	46	42	51	65	74		

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	46	42	27	42	40	29	44	30		
ELL	29	69	62	43	38						
ASN	38	55		85	82						
BLK	21	44	50	35	26	25	17	43			
HSP	52	53	56	65	56	35	47	74	76		
MUL	66	61	58	71	75		69	86	81		
WHT	69	57	54	78	66	57	72	82	82		
FRL	54	48	51	64	57	44	52	72	66		
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	25	48	43	31	42	36	26	49	40		
ELL					80						
BLK	37	62	53	38	40	8	25				
HSP	55	64	71	62	66	53	55	75	71		
MUL	55	59	50	64	56		55	69	63		
WHT	71	67	55	73	64	44	66	83	80		
FRL	51	56	51	56	49	37	51	71	59		

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
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	54
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	69
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	65
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	65
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.

Our African American and Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance.

In regards to the large influx of students with disabilities, our school has had to undergo major instructional shifts to meet the academic and behavioral needs of our students. Last year was the third year that Jefferson utilized a strategic case management model to track ESE student performance. Prior to the implementation of this process, some general education teachers with ESE certification were held responsible for writing IEPs and ensuring compliance. The support facilitation/ case manager model has forced a transformation in how ESE and general education teachers work together and plan. This ongoing process has required a change to school culture and a reassembling of pedagogical ideology.

Nearly 43% of our African American students received multiple referrals (17 students garnered 109 referrals), which resulted in fractured relationships with some staff members. As a result, these students were less willing to participate appropriately in class and struggled with self-regulation and task compliance. Jefferson mirrors the
national trend of struggling to provide African American students with culturally responsive instruction that honors the unique and important qualities of the African American student.

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

.Using data from the 2018-2019 school year, the primary areas of decline include the following:
-ELA Lowest 25%, down 7%
-Math Learning gains, down 13%
-Science Achievement, down 7%
All three of these categories were impacted by placing first year teachers in these subject areas. Subsequently, we had a high rate of turnover mid-year and this disrupted the continuity of instruction. All three of these subject areas were assigned to long-term subs, most of which did not have any experience teaching in the middle school
classroom. As a result of the frequent changes in staffing, student behavioral concerns were mismanaged and the disruption to learning intensified.

Using the progress monitoring tool of Reading Plus we have identified that 36.8% of our students are significantly below grade level in reading, 16.5% are below grade level and 46.5% are at or above grade level.

The MAPs, math progress monitoring is still being given at this time, therefore, our results are not available.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to data from 2018-2019 data that shows Math FSA scores for our 8th graders (not EOC Scores) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our school average was 7% under the state average in 2019. Additionally, our lower math learning gains amongst the lowest 25% are symptomatic of the larger overall trends in our data. The major contributing factor for us was a decline in teacher retention. In 2019-2020 teachers began to work as a team to review data, monitor student progress and identify areas of weaknesses and strengths for students. 2019-2020 SIP action steps including PLC's, team meetings, Kagan strategies for student engagment and instructional rounds helped to improve instruction. The math department is in the early stages of creating teacher made common assessments (pre-Covid). Also, our district will be using MAPs to monitor students in the area of Math. This test identifies what the student is ready to learn as well as areas that need more review. This will continue be an area of growth for the 2020-2021 school year. Some of our ESE and African American students are represented within this subgroup and were impacted by the factors previously outlined.

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

ELA Learning Gains demonstrated a 2% increase as compared to school average for the 2017-2018 school year. New teachers were assigned in our 8th grade ELA and Reading departments. Their expertise, commitment, and ability to build genuine rapport was paramount to helping under-achieving students produced positive results. ELA teachers also worked strategically with ESE Support Facilitators to develop interventions to produce learning gains. These strategies included small group instruction for remedial skills,lunch time study halls to complete missing or incomplete classwork, and common planning time to discuss and review student data.

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

Primary areas of concern are rates of attendance below 90% and students achieving an FSA Score of Level 1 in Math and Language Arts.

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

1. Math Lowest 25%
2. African American Students
3. Students With Disabilities
4. Professional Learning Communities
5. Student Engagement.

*****CONTINUED FROM POSITIVE CULTURE SECTION DUE TO WORD LIMITS**************
Last year (2019) the parents survey indicated that they would like more information on transitioning to high school. This year's results were the same. Over 50% of responding parents requested information on graduation requirements, Bright Futures Scholarships, Financial Aid, SAT/ACT testing and transitioning to high school. As a result of this survey, we have been working with our feeder high school to provide informational nights for our parents to attend. Last year, we hosted one evening, this year, our hope, is to offer more.
Another area of concern is parent input and feedback on school decisions. Although we have parent input on our SAC committee as well as an active JPO, not all parents can participate due to various reasons. Parents are requesting surveys prior to decisions being made.

The student Youth Truth Survey indicates areas that students feel as strengths for our school are in the areas of Relationships and Belonging & Peer Collaboration. The overall survey indicates that students feel they can be themselves around others, like working with their peers, and that students are friendly to each other. The majority of students feel that their teachers believe they can get good grades by trying and that the teachers care about them.

Students feel our areas that need improvement are Culture, Engagement and Academic Rigor. In an effort to improve engagement and academic rigor, we have scheduled for a Kagan training to be held at our school in the Fall of 2021. This was originally planned for August 2020, however due to the COVID pandemic, we have rescheduled for August 2021. Many changes have taken place this year that has helped with Culture. One major area listed by students was the lack of respect both student to teacher and teacher to student. Already this year, we are seeing an improvement in student's behavior towards teachers and teachers reaching out to make connections with students. This has helped to overcome some of the obstacles that were addressed by students. Additionally, we are implementing Social Emotional Learning to help students and teachers learn to deal with their emotions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Math Learning Gains amongst the Lowest Performing 25% of Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus represents the intersectionality of many larger data trends within our learning community. By addressing this area of concern we are able to target students achieving a Level 1 on FSA math, some ESE students, and some African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, students within the lowest performing 25% will show an overall increase of 3-5% in Math Learning Gains
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Department based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Copious research has underscored the efficacy of utilizing PLCs to promote feelings of supportive learning communities, tracking student growth, and making instructional decisions based on pertinent data. This year, all departments will meet weekly in PLCs to monitor student progress. In order to increase accountability, these meetings will be attended by members of administration and the leadership team to collaborate with classroom teachers in devising targeted interventions. Student data will be reviewed weekly to ensure that interventions are being implemented. A growth mindset will be promoted during discussions to cultivate a positive, hopeful energy that will be carried into the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Math teachers will review MAP data to identify students with gaps. During PLC meetings departments will use student data to identify and discuss academic and/or behavioral concerns. To reach students that have gaps in learning due to the COVID, referencing Addressing Unfinished Learning After COVID-19 School Closures, our PLC teams will be making determinations regarding curriculum and questioning the significance of a given unit or lesson:
a. Does the content extend work from earlier units and grade levels?
b. Does the content extend into future content?
c. Does the unit help students deepen conceptual understanding and subject area expertise, such as expertise with mathematical practices or reading comprehension?
d. Is this content that students need to know right now in order to continue learning grade-level subject matter?

Person Responsible	Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)

Students not being successful in math classes will be invited to attend tutoring and morning school to help close the learning gaps.

Person Responsible	Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Students with disabilities and African American students represent our ESSA areas for needed improvement. Each of these students will be individually invited to attend morning school with strategies to help eliminate barriers to learning.

Person Responsible   Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

MTSS members will meet monthly to monitor students not being successful with other interventions.

Person Responsible   Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Students identified as SWD are enrolled/scheduled in an inclusion model classrooms.

Person Responsible   Lena Koch (koch.lena@brevardschools.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA Learning gaps amongst the Lowest Performing 25% of students and identified ESSA subgroups.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus represents the intersectionality of many larger data trends within our learning community. By addressing this area of concern we are able to target students achieving a Level 1on FSA ELA, some ESE students, and some African American students. Students identified as significantly below grade level on reading plus progress monitoring.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, students within the lowest performing 25% will show an overall increase of 5-7% in ELA Learning Gains
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Department based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Copious research has underscored the efficacy of utilizing PLCs to promote feelings of supportive learning communities, tracking student growth, and making instructional decisions based on pertinent data. This year, all departments will meet weekly in PLCs to monitor student progress. In order to increase accountability, these meetings will be attended by members of administration and the leadership team to collaborate with classroom teachers in devising targeted interventions. Student data will be reviewed weekly to ensure that interventions are being implemented. A growth mindset will be promoted during discussions to cultivate a positive, hopeful energy that will be carried into the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA teachers with guidance from the Literacy Coach will review Reading Plus data, common assessments and FSA data to determine areas of need for each student, during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible	Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Students not being successful in ELA classes will be invited to attend tutoring and morning school to help close the learning gaps. With the implementation of a block schedule for this school year, students not showng growth in ELA will be reevaluated for a possible placement in an Intensive Language Arts class for the second part of the school year.

Person Responsible	Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Students with disabilities and African American students represent our ESSA areas for needed improvement. Each of these students will be individually invited to attend morning school with strategies to help eliminate barriers to learning.

Person Responsible	Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

MTSS members will meet monthly to monitor students not being successful with other interventions.

Person Responsible	Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Students identified as SWD are enrolled/scheduled in an inclusion model classrooms.

Person Responsible   Lena Koch (koch.lena@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. During pre-planning, all teachers will be informed of the individual roles and responsibilities pertaining to PLC meetings. Calendar of meetings dates will also be disseminated during this discussion.

2. During PLC meetings departments will use student data to identify and discuss academic and/ or behavioral concerns. To reach students that have gaps in learning due to the COVID, referencing Addressing Unfinished Learning After COVID-19 School Closures, our PLC teams will be making determinations regarding curriculum and questioning the significance of a given unit or lesson:
a. Does the content extend work from earlier units and grade levels?
b. Does the content extend into future content?
c. Does the unit help students deepen conceptual understanding and subject area expertise, such as expertise
with mathematical practices or reading comprehension?
d. Is this content that students need to know right now in order to continue learning grade-level subject matter?

3. Administration and leadership will promote honest, positive, solution-focused dialogue to identify tailored solutions to areas of concern which may include, but are not limited to:
-Small group remediation
-Student engagement strategies based on the Kagan method
-PBIS reinforcement strategies
-Differentiating instruction

4. Teams will continue to meet weekly to monitor the success of chosen interventions. Areas of data to closely monitor include but are not limited to: students with Ds or Fs as their overall grade in a course, attendance concerns, seat-time missed due to disciplinary action, etc.

5. If interventions are not producing desired results, the team will consult district-level subject area coaches or other support staff for potential solutions.

6. Morning school with specific tutoring needs will be offered students who have gaps in their learning. We have developed a plan that allows for a math and ELA teacher to do tutoring 5 days a week with all MESH content available on Fridays.

*****CONTINUED FROM POSITIVE CULTURE SECTION DUE TO WORD LIMIT*************

Additionally, we are working with and training our teachers on Trauma informed education: Jefferson Middle will promote student and teacher safety, topic awareness, and empowerment through training and continued discussions. Teachers and students will provide quarterly feedback using a school-based digital form to evaluate the components of trauma-informed education which include safety, choice, collaboration, trust, and empowerment. Teachers will participate in on-going training to target areas of deficit. Administration will also begin to research and examine larger school-based systems that support the emotional well-being of staff and students. One such offering will be an open processing group for teachers to share their lived experiences, challenges, and success stories.

Culturally responsive teaching (CRT): CRT encourages teachers to dig deeper into student culture and identify common community values. Teachers will include diverse voices in source materials, employ methods of student empowerment and choice making, and incorporate more hands-on and/or project-based learning opportunities. CRT emphasizes the importance of

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.

According to the TNTP Insight Survey, Jefferson has improved in 8 of the 10 categories that appeared on the 2018 and 2019 insight survey results. Our biggest gain was in the area of hiring. Followed by Academic Opportunity, Peer Culture and tying for fourth place are Instructional Planning for Student Growth and Observation and Feedback.

Jefferson's administrative team has been working with the faculty and including them in the hiring process, this has allowed the peers of the new hire to have valuable input in their team members, allowing for the increase in Hiring and Peer Culture as well as Academic Opportunity by including those that wish to take on more of a leadership role. The area that tied for fourth, with increases of .6 in both over 2018, is indicative of our efforts to give more feedback and more informal observations to allow teachers the opportunity to work on areas of need as well as promote a positive culture with the accolades in areas they excel. 2019 also had us removing unnecessary meetings and "working the work" to help students grow academically, as a department. The PLC process, although in infant stages, has led to increased discussions on student performance and reflections by all teachers. This is a good indication that instructional planning for student growth should continue to improve.

The area of concern from the Insight Survey is Professional Development. We went down -.3 in this area. Not far behind is Learning Environment at -.2. As a result, we are continuing to work on our PBIS/MTSS process. At Jefferson we believe that a Positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS)/Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), creates the opportunity for a universal system of recognition for positive behavior that meets Jefferson's expectations of being responsible, respectful, and prepared. PBIS also encourages the use of discipline "ladders" that create consistent consequences to behavior that is outside the community's expectations for safety, respect, and scholarly habits. MTSS allows for the identification of students who are not being served by the school-wide measures and routines. This includes both the identification of students who need additional academic progress monitoring and assistance as we well as students who requires more intensive behavioral supports such as mentoring programs, behavior intervention plans, and unique recognition and reward systems. This is our third year using PBIS, and recent studies show it takes at least three years for the system to show significant improvements in the classroom and the school as a whole.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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