Jeaga Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jeaga Middle School

3777 N JOG RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://jgms.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Allen

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 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: 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	
* 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 Palm Beach 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

Jeaga Middle School

3777 N JOG RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://jgms.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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 of Jeaga Middle School is to provide a diverse, academic, physical, emotional, social, and safe learning environment that fosters high expectations for students' potential and success through appropriate instruction; innovative instructional strategies, rigorous standards, and educational and technological resources, while instilling in our students a desire to become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through quality and innovative teaching, instructional strategies and learning, Jeaga Middle School will be recognized as one of the premier middle schools in Palm Beach County for educating, empowering and equipping all students with the knowledge, skills, and character to become personally fulfilled, interdependent, socially responsible and productive citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allen, Anthony	Reading Coach	Oversees all staff, functions and budget for the school as it pertains to student achievement and learning.
Couey Brisson, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	Electives AVID Clubs/SGA Substitutes/Coverage Title 1/Tutorials Handbooks SBT Industry Certification ESP 6th Grade
Maher, Colin	Assistant Principal	ESOL Crisis Response Plan/Drills School Improvement Plan/SAC Field Trips/Fundraisers Master Calendar SIS - grades Duty Posts Master Schedule Certification (Teacher, CPR, First Aid, etc) 8th Grade
Timpone, Michael	Assistant Principal	ESE Testing/ Assessment Schedule Textbooks Transportation Athletics Leasing 7th Grade Principal Designee

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/1/2017, Anthony Allen

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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

908

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	297	332	279	0	0	0	0	908
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	63	63	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	131	121	0	0	0	0	365
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	72	93	0	0	0	0	236
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	299	269	250	0	0	0	0	818
FY21 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	258	183	0	0	0	0	746

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	342	323	282	0	0	0	0	947
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	76	84	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	98	149	0	0	0	0	265
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	127	120	0	0	0	0	264
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	85	94	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	79	99	0	0	0	0	252
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	180	192	0	0	0	0	576
FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	201	200	0	0	0	0	607

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	149	144	168	0	0	0	0	461

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	80	70	76	0	0	0	0	226
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	13

2020-21 - 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	342	323	282	0	0	0	0	947
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	76	84	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	98	149	0	0	0	0	265
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	127	120	0	0	0	0	264
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	85	94	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	79	99	0	0	0	0	252
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	180	192	0	0	0	0	576
FY20 Math Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	201	200	0	0	0	0	607

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	149	144	168	0	0	0	0	461

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	80	70	76	0	0	0	0	226
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	13

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				36%	58%	54%	37%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	56%	54%	44%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	49%	47%	36%	49%	47%
Math Achievement				36%	62%	58%	37%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains				40%	60%	57%	40%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	53%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				30%	52%	51%	37%	55%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				66%	75%	72%	66%	75%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
06	2021					
	2019	34%	58%	-24%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	28%	53%	-25%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	58%	-21%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	17%	35%	-18%	54%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	31%	64%	-33%	46%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	28%	51%	-23%	48%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	72%	-10%	71%	-9%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	60%	-60%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring also allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. Various reports will be used to monitor and support student learning. Fall, winter diagnostics, USA, FSQ, FSA.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36.6	31.5	28.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.8	31.9	28.7
	Students With Disabilities	22.2	23.3	22.2
	English Language Learners	11.8	10.8	9.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31.5	20.8	24.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.4	20.3	23.6
	Students With Disabilities	29.4	13.3	16.7
	English Language Learners	18.4	10.0	15.3

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32.0	24.7	23.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.1	24.5	23.3
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	7.1	8.3
	English Language Learners	9.3	9.2	9.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17.7	17.5	14.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.6	16.7	13.4
	Students With Disabilities	6.7	10.4	9.6
	English Language Learners	5.4	5.9	5.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students		24.1	28.9
	Economically Disadvantaged		22.6	27.5
	Students With Disabilities		14.0	17.6
	English Language Learners		9.1	8.1

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42.7	42.4	38.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.3	43.0	39.0
	Students With Disabilities	17.5	18.9	18.9
	English Language Learners	0	5.4	5.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20.2	21.3	21.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.2	21.3	22.0
	Students With Disabilities	3.6	6.1	6.0
	English Language Learners	0	5.4	5.4
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	47.8	47.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.9	48.0	47.5
	Students With Disabilities	14.6	20.8	20.4
	English Language Learners	28.9	31.9	31.3

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	25	23	13	18	22	14	21	67		
ELL	22	29	23	15	11	22	5	37	65		
BLK	29	33	33	17	14	20	16	35	76		
HSP	30	33	22	18	13	18	25	39	64		
MUL	45	40		10							
WHT	37	29		16	12						
FRL	29	32	27	18	13	20	21	37	68		
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	18	39	37	19	33	35	17	44			
ELL	24	42	46	25	32	38	18	55	59		
BLK	40	47	34	35	40	35	35	72	76		

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
HSP	31	45	47	36	38	44	25	58	69		
MUL	22	59		38	60						
WHT	38	47		45	43						
FRL	35	46	42	35	39	39	29	66	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	13	32	39	15	25	21	20	40			
ELL	16	35	32	19	27	31	8	46			
BLK	40	45	35	37	42	42	37	73	69		
HSP	31	41	36	34	37	34	36	58	45		
MUL	50	53		41	43						
WHT	36	46		44	50			64			
FRL	36	44	36	36	40	39	36	65	58		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	295
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	24
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA and math scores need improvement across the board and should be the focus with regards to strategies and services that we offer students.
Math
Grade 6
2019 - 38.3%
2021 - 11.1%

Grade 7
2019 - 16.7%
2021 - 8.7%

Grade 8
2019 - 30.6%
2021 - 15%

ELA
Grade 6
2019 - 34.2%
2021 - 31.7%

Grade 7
2019 - 27.5%
2021 - 25.5%

Grade 8
2019 - 36.6%
2021 - 30.2%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math seems is the area where we are weakest across the grade levels.
Math
Grade 6
2019 - 38.3%
2021 - 11.1%

Grade 7
2019 - 16.7%
2021 - 8.7%

Grade 8
2019 - 30.6%
2021 - 15%

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Hybrid learning was not a successful model as it created a foreign learning environment in which neither students nor teacher were familiar with successful strategies. Teachers were trained minimally and there was no training for students. In order for substantial improvement to be expected, the curriculum would need to be altered from grades 6-8 at either the state or district level to account for the loss of traditional learning during the pandemic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We declined in all areas as evidenced by the data below.
Math
Grade 6
2019 - 38.3%
2021 - 11.1%

Grade 7
2019 - 16.7%
2021 - 8.7%

Grade 8
2019 - 30.6%
2021 - 15%

ELA
Grade 6
2019 - 34.2%
2021 - 31.7%

Grade 7
2019 - 27.5%
2021 - 25.5%

Grade 8
2019 - 36.6%
2021 - 30.2%

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

N/A

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will need to modify the curriculum to account for the years worth of slowed learning due to the hybrid model. Collaborative Planning Communities (PLCs) occur every week per subject area. Grade level teachers meet with the SSCC, academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed. Subject areas meet for Common Planning. Teams create goals and plans based on standards, domains, units of study, and big ideas. It is then determined how all subject areas can be incorporated into the subject being taught.

The decrease in percent for level 3 and above by grade based on COVID learning option is as follows:
Grade 6
Distance Learning - 35.3%
On Campus - 25.5%

Grade 7
Distance Learning - 29.9%
On Campus - 15.5%

Grade 8
Distance Learning - 34.9%
On Campus - 20.3%

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Ms. Cara Davis will work with departments during LTMs and department meetings to provide learning strategies and support using data from FSQ, USA diagnostic and classroom assessments. Collaborative Planning Communities (PLCs) occur every week per grade level. Subject area teachers meet with the SSCC, academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards based learning goal scales. Subject areas meet for Common Planning. Teams create goals and plans based on standards, domains, units of study, and big ideas. It is then determined how all subject areas can be incorporated into the subject being taught.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Tutoring will be offered to students needing extra help. Administration will work closely with teachers to improve on teaching strategies. Collaborative Planning Communities (PLCs) occur every week per subject area. Grade level teachers meet with the SSCC, academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed. Subject areas meet for Common Planning. Teams create goals and plans based on standards, domains, units of study, and big ideas. It is then determined how all subject areas can be incorporated into the subject being taught.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math diagnostic data for students dropped as much as 27.2%
Measurable Outcome:	We hope to improve 3-5% per grade level.
Monitoring:	Diagnostic data will be compared between last year and this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Colin Maher (colin.maher@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Citing textual evidence will be a focus for improvement. Standards Based Instruction will continue to be a primary focus during instruction planning sessions, professional learning communities and data chats with teachers and students. Resources and strategies will be aligned to grade level standards and scaffolds will be put in place to support students who are not yet performing at their grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Clearly distance learning has hindered growth considering brick and mortar strategies are not conducive to online learning and the bank of knowledge regarding engaging distance learning strategies is very limited. Now that we are back brick and mortar we can refocus our efforts on strategies teachers and students are familiar with.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The following items are discussed at the beginning of each school year and are revisited during scheduled professional development days. Teachers have the ability to refer students to our School Based Team (SBT). These identified students are discussed in weekly meetings and are given Tier 1, 2, or 3 interventions based on our RTI (Response to Intervention) process. Possible reasons for an SBT referral include truancy and attendance issues, behavioral concerns, academic concerns, and emotional or social concerns. RTI interventions can include daily or weekly progress reports to track academic or attendance concerns, behavior plan points sheets, enrollment in a credit recovery program (Compass), intensive (remedial reading or math) classes or an

assigned mentor as examples. Students who have accumulated more than ten out of school suspension days, ten in-school suspension days, or ten unexcused absences are automatically referred to the SBT.

Single school culture (Academics, Behavior, Climate) ensuring an equitable & equal access for all students.

Academics: Collaborative Planning Communities (PLCs) occur every week per grade level. Grade level teachers meet with the SSCC, academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed. Grade levels meet for Common Planning. Teams create goals and plans based on standards, domains, units of study, and big ideas. It is then determined how all subject areas can be incorporated into the subject being taught.

Behavior: implementing a School-wide Positive Behavior System. CHAMPS is being implemented by all staff members in all areas of the school.

Climate: Universal Behavioral Matrix

District resources allocated to our school:
Regional support teams
Curriculum support
Reading Interventionist
Single School Culture Coordinator
Curriculum support -Professional Development
MTSS - Professional Development
Multicultural support

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42; continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:
The History of the Holocaust
The History of Black and African Americans
The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics
The Contributions of Women
The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment with school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music

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.

Jaega will continue to foster positive relationships with parents, families, and stakeholders through parent engagement meetings that will focus on the holistic needs of students. These meetings will focus on educating parents on the resources that are available to their learners, as well as strategies that can be used to support the learning that takes place in the classroom.

Jaega implements a Single School Culture by consistently referring to the universal guidelines using the behavioral matrix and teacher expectations are covered and re-taught with all students. Communicating with parents and monitoring SwPBS ensures success. We instill an appreciation for multicultural diversity through anti-bullying campaign, structured lessons, and implementation of SwPBS. Students are continuously praised for adhering to the matrix and are given incentives through several recognition mechanisms for behavior and academics.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Jeaga will communicate with all stakeholders regarding SAC, athletic events, parent trainings and open house through phone calls, texts, email as well as the marquee. We hold monthly SAC meetings, parent training nights and pep rallies during the day for students. We celebrate the success of our students who are academically successful and at the end of the year celebrate the students moving on to high school. We utilize wPBIS to reward student who have shown positive behavior. We offer many sports and clubs (when school is open full brick and mortar) that allow students the opportunity to engage in campus activities that are not academic. The after school program offers students an array of non-academic activities to choose from to enhance their middle school experience here at Jeaga middle school. We have worked with local colleges and universities to bring student teachers on board to help build future educators.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00