James Madison Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Madison Middle School

3375 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Travis Di ESE L J

Start Date for this Principal: 2/3/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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.](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

James Madison Middle School

3375 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

http://www.madison.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	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission at James Madison Middle is to lift the whole child by providing equity and access for all students to become productive members of their community and contributors to a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

James Madison Middle School's vision is to provide every student with rigorous instruction, equity in opportunity, and a high quality education. Our focus is to prepare students for success by creating career and postsecondary pathways to the workforce.

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
Bowens, Latasha	Principal	Responsible for all Instruction, School Leadership, and all school based operations.
Watkins, Lara	Assistant Principal	All functions of Curriculum and instruction.
Bryan, Katheryn	Instructional Coach	Leads the science and math departments providing support on instructional strategies, using data to inform instruction.
Smith, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach modeling and monitoring instruction in reading and writing schoolwide.
Crum, Keila	Teacher, K-12	Avid Coordinator, Instructional Support for Implementing Avid programming, and Avid instructional leader.
Velasquez, Bobby	School Counselor	Responsible for school wide academic advisement, Data monitoring and tracking students at risk. Responsible for Academic advisement and preparation for high school. Leader of social emotional learning and behavioral intervention.
Clarke, Cris	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Proactive discipline, Schoolwide PBIS administrator, Math instructional leader, and Instructional monitor for students at risk.
Barratt, Alyssa	Attendance/ Social Work	Facilitates support for student social emotional and behavior needs. Serves as a leader for school wide social emotional training and support.
Mastroianni, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	English/Language Arts Department Chair, ELA instructional leader, the department's curriculum creation, documentation, and development including, defining skills and content alignment, evaluation, and assessment expectations.
McCullough, Micah	Instructional Media	Innov8 STEAM director and E-learning director. Serves as a Literacy leader and 20 Book Challenge administrator.
Trahan, Ilea	Dean	Serves as discipline support (Dean of discipline), LEA, and Testing coordinator. Monitors test scores and other relevant data and Restorative Practice facilitator.
Boyd, Benny	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair and Technology Leader at James Madison Middle School.
Purkiss, Kerryanne	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Language Arts Department Chair, English Teacher, and Intensive Reading Instructional Mentor.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Plews, Stacey	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair and LEA for James Madison Middle.
Rice, Heidi	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Elective Department Chair and Innov8 teacher.
Stahl, Maya	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair and Teacher Support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/3/2020, Travis Di ESE L 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.*

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.*

5

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*

School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%)
	2017-18: C (49%)
	2016-17: C (45%)
	2015-16: C (42%)
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	238	234	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	96	0	0	0	0	219
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	82	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	47	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	45	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/22/2020

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	279	256	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	34	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	131	125	0	0	0	0	256

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	120	0	0	0	0	235

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	279	256	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	34	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	17	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	77	0	0	0	0	158

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	120	0	0	0	0	235

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	47	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	36

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	39%	59%	54%	42%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	56%	54%	43%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	48%	47%	29%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	66%	58%	45%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	35%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	37%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	52%	51%	42%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	75%	72%	66%	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	33%	58%	-25%	52%	-19%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	43%	63%	-20%	56%	-13%
	2018	43%	65%	-22%	58%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	52%	62%	-10%	54%	-2%
	2018	50%	62%	-12%	54%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	23%	43%	-20%	46%	-23%
	2018	19%	41%	-22%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	53%	-9%	48%	-4%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	50%	-12%
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	68%	74%	-6%	71%	-3%
2018	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
Compare		-2%			
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	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Compare		10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
Compare		24%			

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	21	40	31	20	33	30	13	39			
BLK	24	40	32	23	33	31	15	55	58		
HSP	38	44	31	71	63		56	75	71		
MUL	52	54		52	58		36	80			
WHT	42	41	35	57	54	53	51	70	74		
FRL	35	43	35	44	46	36	41	63	67		
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	12	29	33	16	38	33	24	36			
BLK	30	33	19	24	40	27	28	56	70		
HSP	33	39	33	39	42	50	8	59	60		
MUL	38	58		44	61	67	40	64	100		
WHT	49	45	45	53	47	39	47	75	65		
FRL	41	43	37	42	48	37	34	66	59		
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	12	30	20	10	32	34	19	32			
BLK	21	30	25	21	30	22	22	44	60		
HSP	29	42	64	42	45	45	47	56			
MUL	43	37		46	33		30	59	91		
WHT	48	46	25	50	35	42	46	73	64		
FRL	33	40	29	36	35	35	32	63	60		

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	49
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	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
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	56

Hispanic Students	
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	57
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	53
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	46
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.

English Language Arts historically has performed at 40 percent or more for proficiency in English Language Arts. For the 2018-19 school year, our performance score regressed from 43 percent to 33 percent of students performing at grade level expectations. This trend has matriculated from our students elementary instructional experience as a result of lower reading comprehension and reading fluency ability of as reflected in our initial benchmark assessment in September 2020. The first benchmark assessment (September 2020) revealed that the 2020-21 student cohort composed of 65 percent of students with 2 or more years behind expected grade level reading performance. By our second benchmark assessment (November 2020), our school moved from 65 percent to 61 percent of students with 2 or more years below grade level expectation. Although we are pushing the towards decreasing this number, we will need to increase the acceleration of our team increasing student ability to read and comprehend fluently.

As a result of this urgency, we have implemented direct and center-based instruction with students based on progress monitoring data in our Intensive Language Arts Classrooms. We have determined a critical need for collaboration between ILA and ELA in both courses.

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

Across the board, our ELA scores dropped in overall achievement 44% to 39%, ELA learning gains 43% to 42%, ELA lowest 25% students 40% to 35% in the 2018-2019 school year. In the monitoring of students with disabilities, Madison Middle School experienced a 5% drop within our lowest quartile students. Our team analyzed the data and determined that our instructional approach to addressing student deficits will need to adapt to student needs. We additionally noted that there are instructional coaching and training needs to help instructional staff with analyzing/disaggregating student data, implementing prescriptive instruction to remediate learning deficits, and providing direct feedback and parents concerning performance.

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.

Overall achievement for ELA in 2018-2019 school year fell to 39% proficiency, this was a 5% decline from the previous school year. This decline in ELA proficiency placed Madison 15% below the state average of 54% proficiency in ELA. Among our two ESSA groups our Black/African Students declined 6% in overall ELA achievement resulting in only 24% demonstrating proficiency in ELA.

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

Our Geometry EOC pass rate went from 76% to 100% in 2018-2019, which is a 24% increase. Our Geometry teacher utilized engaging lessons, standards based instructions, district approved curriculum resources and materials, provided weekly tutoring opportunities, and maintained high expectations for all students. As a result of all of these interventions, every student passed the Geometry EOC. We know that engaging and standards based instruction, as well as maintaining high expectations for all students played an incredibly pivotal role in the achievement of our students.

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

Based on our Early Warning Signs about 123 7th grade students currently have course failures in ELA and 120 7th grade students have a course failure in Math. We currently have a total of 238 7th grade students enrolled for the 2020-2021 school year. With an estimated 50% of our 7th graders have course failures in ELA and Math, we have determined that closer measures of progress monitoring will need to be implemented to ensure students receive extended learning opportunities to address deficits in learning.

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

1. Reading Growth
2. Academic Learning Gains in ELA & Mathematics
3. Academic proficiency in academic core subjects (Math, Science, ELA, & Social Studies)
4. Increasing access to Rigorous Coursework and Industry Certifications
5. Positive School Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Madison Middle School students declined in FSA ELA scores during the 2018-2019 school year. This resulted in a corresponding decline in performance among the lowest 25% and overall learning gains among students. Our instructional team identified this as our instructional focus due to sizable deficit and the impact of reading and writing ability on all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Madison Middle School will increase ELA gains and proficiency by 3 percentile points for the 2020-21 School year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Madison Middle Schools will implement targeted instruction based on the progress monitoring of student performance in both English Language Arts and Intensive Language Arts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this specific strategy originates from our research with working with our students and analyzing progress monitoring data with instructional teams. Students in our lower quartile have reflected a need for targeted direct instruction, immediate instructional feedback, and academic conferencing. Our instructional team noticed that students experienced an increase in performance when provided with targeted direct instruction and immediate communication regarding their performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase targeted interventions and direct instruction in ILA and ELA classrooms.

Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

Provide modeling and professional develop training for center based instruction and direct feedback.

Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

Create school wide literacy initiatives to increase reading performance.

Person Responsible	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)

Increase capacity of PLC teams to monitor student growth through common assessments and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)

Incorporate incentives through PBIS incentives for academic progress in reading.

Person Responsible	Cris Clarke (clarke.cris@brevardschools.org)

Incorporate AVID executive functioning and organizational strategies in reading classrooms.

Person Responsible	Keila Crum (crum.keila@brevardschools.org)

Increase remediation through extended learning opportunities through AVID support.

Person Responsible	Keila Crum (crum.keila@brevardschools.org)

Collaboration and planning with both English Language Arts and Intensive Language Arts teachers.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Other specifically relating to Reading

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Madison Middle school will focus on increasing reading comprehension and fluency with students at Madison Middle School. With over 65 percent of our students behind in 2 years or more of reading performance, there is an urgent need to close the gap between student current progress and grade level performance. We will need to accelerate improvement in increasing student reading achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Madison Middle will focus on improving reading performance to 50 percent of students by 3rd benchmark assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our instructional team will focus on increasing planning and articulation between our Intensive Language Arts and English Language arts classrooms by focusing on building student reading and writing proficiency and increasing overall growth. Our instructional teams in ILA classrooms will focus on intensive center based and direct instruction within the 90 minute reading block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing current data trends, students at Madison score within 40 percent of students at grade level proficiency on state assessments in ELA. At the first benchmark, students scored within 34 percent of students at or above grade level. The rationale for creating an alignment between ILA and ELA is based on increasing opportunities for building skill and proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly data monitoring with Intensive Language Arts and English Language Arts teams.

Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

Training with Intensive Language Arts teachers for IRLA reading curriculum

Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@brevardschools.org)

Support and implementation of center based instruction

Person Responsible	Deborah Smith (smith.deborahk@brevardschools.org)

Collaboration and planning between ILA and ELA instructional teams

Person Responsible	Kelli Mastroianni (mastroianni.kelli@brevardschools.org)

Focus on incorporating reading instruction and strategies in all content area classes.

Person Responsible	Deborah Smith (smith.deborahk@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Expand and define programmatic offering of CTE courses that lead to certifications for students at Madison. Currently Madison Middle school has a small number of CTE courses as a part of our Innov8 program. Our goal is to expand the programs offered within the program to increase engagement and participation for all students at Madison.
Measurable Outcome:	Our Innov8 program includes currently 20 percent of the student population at Madison. It is our desire to expand access for early career and technical pathways for our students at Madison Middle. Our goal is to increase program participation to 30 percent by the 2021-22 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conferencing with rising 7th grade middle school students to discuss programmatic options at James Madison Middle Schools.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our current program includes 20 percent of students at Madison limiting the number of students with access to technical programs. This is a critical element as the career and technical programs serve as a lever of engagement for middle school students. In the vein of engagement, our school based team determined that we have a need to increase outreach and planning to build the programmatic options for career programs at James Madison Middle.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted Recruitment for rising 7th grade students.

Person Responsible	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)

Outreach to parent groups to discuss programming at James Madison Middle School for the 2021-2022 school year.

Person Responsible	Bobby Velasquez (velasquez.bobby@brevardschools.org)

Create plan of action for increasing program offerings and alignment to feeder high school programs.

Person Responsible	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2019-2020 school year, James Madison Middle School processed slightly over 400 disciplinary referrals by November 2019. By March of the same school year, 1100 disciplinary referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to decrease discipline incidences by 25 percent for the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cris Clarke (clarke.cris@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategies that our instructional team will use is to establish school wide PBIS incentives for academic and behavior expectations. In addition, we will incorporate restorative practice interventions to build social instruction as a part of disciplinary consequences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We analyzed our discipline data and determined that most occurring incidences occurred were general classroom based occurrences. In our estimation, instruction for appropriate leadership behavior and preparation for high school is a critical need for the students at Madison Middle based on our school wide data.

Action Steps to Implement

Positive Behavior Support plan and implementation for the 2021-22 school year.

Person Responsible	Cris Clarke (clarke.cris@brevardschools.org)

Restorative practice training for all Madison Middle School faculty and staff.

Person Responsible	Latasha Bowens (bowens.latasha@brevardschools.org)

Implement small group social emotional lessons for highest needs students.

Person Responsible	Bobby Velasquez (velasquez.bobby@brevardschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	James Madison Middle School has a trend of math performance in the range of 50 percent of students performing at grade level expectations. Our first MAP assessment revealed a regression in the baseline of academic performance in math for the incoming cohort. For the 2018-19 school year, students entered with 42 percent scoring below grade level proficiency. For the 2020-21 school year, students entered lower than expected in math scoring at 68 percent of students performing below proficiency. This significant percentage of students entering in the cohort below proficiency is indicative of student regression in academics in mathematics as a direct result of instructional loss due to the health crisis.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on our students progress monitoring data and historical performance trends for students in our cohort, we have set growth goals for our students. Madison Middle has set instructional goals for math performance to move the percentage of students scoring below grade level proficiency by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive small group and center based instruction in standard math courses for 7th and 8th grade. In addition, our math instructional teams will progress monitor through common formative assessments and remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After reviewing our student progress monitoring data, our team determined that some of our students lack math skills and math fluency required for meeting grade level expectations. In addition, students have experienced some regression within the several months due to the current health crisis.

Action Steps to Implement	
Direct and center based instruction in standard math courses in the 90 minute instructional block.	
Person Responsible	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)
Intensive small group remediation and instruction for target groups based on assessment data.	
Person Responsible	Stacey Plews (plews.stacey@brevardschools.org)
Weekly progress monitoring, goal setting, and student conferencing in intensive math classes.	
Person Responsible	Keila Crum (crum.keila@brevardschools.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	James Madison Middle Schools trend of science performance ranges in the 40 percentile growth index. Based on academic performance data and common assessments, we believe that we have a critical need to provide students with remediation and rigorous instruction with foundational knowledge of concepts in science content. Our goal at James Madison Middle School is to increase science performance 3 percentile points of performance for the 2020-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	James Madison Middle will increase Science proficiency by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our team will focus on rigorous standards based instruction and collaboration for science instruction for the 2020-21 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In analyzing student performance on formative assessments, our team realized that our students within our lower quartile lack some background knowledge in the science content. Our team has worked to provide students with remediation of the content standards that students have experienced an academic struggle with. In addition, our team has determined that there is a critical need to continue remediation school wide with Science inquiry based lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase Professional Learning Community planning and collaboration. This action step will facilitate development of common assessments and progress monitoring with Science department.

Person Responsible	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)

Expand S.T.E.A.M (Innov8) programmatic function to a school wide concept. This action step will include integrating hands on science instruction for all students school wide.

Person Responsible	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)

Establish interdisciplinary planning and collaboration to create integrated instruction of math, and science.

Person Responsible	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)

Implement progress monitoring of common assessments.

Person Responsible	Katheryn Bryan (bryan.katheryn@brevardschools.org)

Implement school wide STEM activities to increase student understanding of science content.

Person Responsible	Micah McCullough (mccullough.micah@brevardschools.org)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	James Madison Middle School has historically met achievement near 70 percent for proficiency in Social Studies. Although Social Studies has been a stronger area of academic achievement for our school, our team desires to increase performance in this area 3 percentile points. In addition, we would like to incorporate reading instruction and strategies in the social studies content courses.
Measurable Outcome:	James Madison Middle School will increase student academic proficiency by 3 percentile points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maya Stahl (stahl.maya@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Incorporate professional development for reading strategies with the social studies teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our leadership team has determined a need in baseline reading comprehension and fluency for students at James Madison Middle School. This instruction will need to be incorporated in the Social Studies content to close the gap of underperformance in reading for our students.

Action Steps to Implement

Incorporate reading and writing strategies within Social Studies classroom.

Person Responsible	Maya Stahl (stahl.maya@brevardschools.org)

Establish opportunities for inter-disciplinary collaboration with Professional Learning Communities in Reading, ELA/ILA, and Social Studies.

Person Responsible	Lara Watkins (watkins.lara@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.

Madison Middle School's Parent Survey data reveals parents would like to have more communication from the school. In addition, Parents shared that they would like to be more involved in the decision making process. For the 2020-21 school year, Madison Middle School is conducting monthly parent meetings as a parent academy via Zoom as a tool of presenting critical information to parents. In addition, our school has started conversations with our parent groups and has created a new PTO at Madison Middle. We additionally increased participation with our SAC meetings by increasing communication through our Parent Newsletter to encourage participation with our School Advisory Meetings.

Insight survey data reflected opportunities for growth related to our instructional staff (Teachers) felt that school leadership at Madison does not seek feedback from teachers. Our school leadership has expanded the number of teachers serving on our school based leadership team. We have established a leadership team which includes teacher leaders and established a steering committee to collaborate in areas of growth for our school. Additionally, our school has established opportunities for teachers to lead in professional development, school planning, and teacher support for struggling teachers.

Youth Truth survey data from the 2019-20 school year revealed one of Madison's strengths is that many students feel that they leave Madison prepared for high school. Students reported that they believed that stronger relationships with teachers is an area of growth for Madison Middle. Additionally, students felt that classroom disruptions at times hindered learning in some of their classrooms last year.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Obj 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.) the following will be implemented:

-Restorative practices facilitated by a school based administrator, social worker, or school counselor
-Re-entry meetings with students who are suspended for egregious offenses or recurring negative behavior mental health strategies, and trauma informed classroom trainings
-Social worker and School counselor will progress monitor student progress
-Teacher support and training for building relationships with students and classroom management
-PBIS training and support for teachers

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