

Brevard Public Schools

# Delaura Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Delaura Middle School

300 JACKSON AVE, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Tina Susin M**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>7-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 21%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (76%)<br>2017-18: A (73%)<br>2016-17: A (74%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Delaura Middle School

300 JACKSON AVE, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2020-21 Title I School</b> | <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Middle School<br>7-8                                    | No                            | 24%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 24%   |

## School Grades History

| Year<br>Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|               | 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.**

To provide a positive school environment where students may develop their individual skills and talents and prepare for their future endeavors in high school and beyond. Our school culture will foster security, responsibility, respect, and achievement for all.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To provide a quality education in a friendly and supportive atmosphere.

### 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   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Lebrun, Jeremy | Principal           | Oversee all curriculum, facilities, security and school related operations for DeLaura Middle School. Primary instructional leader of the building focused on faculty Professional development, student achievement and community building.   |
| Barna, Laura   | Assistant Principal | Oversee all aspects of curriculum, instructional resources, FTE, academic departments and student scheduling. Provide faculty with professional development and connect district resources teachers to our school.  |
| Evans, Amy     | Assistant Principal | Primarily responsible for student discipline process, facility operations, business partners and student activities. Other areas of focus include MTSS coordinator, business partner liaison, facilities responsibilities, security/drill management, FOCUS school leader and student recognition activities. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Tina Susin M

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**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**

51

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

848

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

4

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

6

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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 | 0 | 434 | 414 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 848 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45  | 50  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 95  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 4   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 12  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 14  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 24  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 34  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 47  |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 33  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 50  |

**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  | 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 | 4 | 3 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4 |



**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/14/2021

**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 | 0 | 384 | 417 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 801   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 26  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 20  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |

**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 | 18 | 20 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

**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 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**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 | 0 | 384 | 417 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 801   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 26  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 20  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |

**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 | 18 | 20 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 38 |

**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 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3  |

**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             |        |          |       | 80%    | 59%      | 54%   | 77%    | 59%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 64%    | 56%      | 54%   | 59%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 66%    | 48%      | 47%   | 52%    | 45%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 91%    | 66%      | 58%   | 88%    | 65%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 69%    | 55%      | 57%   | 64%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 73%    | 45%      | 51%   | 74%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 69%    | 52%      | 51%   | 70%    | 54%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 93%    | 75%      | 72%   | 88%    | 72%      | 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 |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 77%    | 58%      | 19%                        | 52%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 63%      | 17%                        | 56%   | 24%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   |      | -77%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07    | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>MATH</b>       |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
|                   | 2019        | 87%           | 62%             | 25%                               | 54%          | 33%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2021        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 82%           | 43%             | 39%                               | 46%          | 36%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -87%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 08                | 2021        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 68%           | 53%             | 15%                               | 48%          | 20%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>CIVICS EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>       | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021              |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019              | 93%           | 74%             | 19%                          | 71%          | 22%                       |

| <b>HISTORY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019               | 98%           | 61%             | 37%                          | 61%          | 37%                       |

| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                | 98%           | 60%             | 38%                          | 57%          | 41%                       |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

Math - NWEA Map Test

ELA - Reading Inventory

| Grade 7               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| Number/% Proficiency  |                            | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 58   | 61     | 59     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39   | 37     | 39     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 30   | 20     | 22     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 33     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       |      | Fall   | Winter |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 78.5 | 78.5   | 74.7   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       |      | Fall   | Winter |
| Civics                | All Students               | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 8               |                            |                      |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |                      | 64   | 66     | 60     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | 45   | 51     | 39     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 31   | 24     | 26     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 20   | 20     | 0      |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |                      | 68.7 | 45     | 28.8   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

**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                                       | 27       | 34     | 36          | 34        | 37      | 29           | 19       | 70      | 50        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 43       | 69     |             | 68        | 47      |              |          | 85      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 77       | 71     |             | 93        | 69      |              | 80       | 75      | 100       |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 40     |             | 34        | 28      |              | 35       | 73      | 70        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 66       | 62     | 45          | 65        | 46      | 52           | 50       | 83      | 80        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 71       | 49     |             | 60        | 42      | 30           | 63       | 81      | 70        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 56     | 43          | 76        | 49      | 42           | 69       | 92      | 83        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 47     | 35          | 55        | 42      | 39           | 44       | 70      | 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 |
| SWD                                       | 28       | 53     | 50          | 52        | 59      | 56           | 24       | 66      | 15        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 54       | 69     |             | 71        | 71      | 73           |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| ASN                                       | 89       | 74     |             | 100       | 74      |              | 86       |         | 89        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 38     |             | 82        | 75      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 72       | 63     | 67          | 85        | 70      | 76           | 61       | 85      | 72        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 85       | 58     | 83          | 92        | 79      | 85           | 83       | 90      | 72        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 81       | 65     | 67          | 92        | 68      | 70           | 71       | 95      | 78        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 72       | 63     | 62          | 86        | 70      | 71           | 60       | 86      | 66        |                   |                     |

  

| 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                                       | 21       | 33     | 32          | 34        | 67      | 66           | 9        | 58      | 20        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       |          |        |             |           | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 85       | 75     |             | 89        | 63      |              | 85       | 93      | 100       |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 45       | 37     | 45          | 55        | 63      | 67           | 36       | 46      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 75       | 63     | 64          | 79        | 58      | 58           | 64       | 89      | 77        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 52     | 45          | 86        | 53      | 75           | 61       | 87      | 76        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 80       | 59     | 50          | 91        | 66      | 79           | 73       | 90      | 82        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 64       | 52     | 49          | 80        | 58      | 73           | 61       | 82      | 69        |                   |                     |

**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  | 63  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 568 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9   |
| Percent Tested  | 95% |

  

| Subgroup Data   |     |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 37  |
| 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                                      | 62  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| 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   | 81  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 46  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 61  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 58  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 65  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| 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?

When analyzing trend data across a variety of categories several trends emerge:

Grade Level - Looking at trend data for the most recent progress monitoring, our 7th grade groups showed lower scores overall than our 8th graders.

Subgroups - Our ESE students were identified as having the largest need for improvement when compared to the school average. We have consistently added ESE support in the forms of additional staff, fiscal resources and other supports. Additionally, our ESE students have consistently scored below our general population. Additional supports are needed and will be part of our school improvement efforts.

ELA - Significant Gaps exist between our FRL & ESE population in comparison to our general education group. Looking at the trend data, there is a 20% point gap between our FRL and general education students on progress monitoring assessments. Additionally, there is an approximately 30% achievement gap between our ESE and general education scores. There are two subgroups where more support is needed.

Math - Similar to ELA, math assessments showed significant gaps between our FRL and ESE students.

SEL - Staff and Guidance counselors have noticed an increasing trend in the number of students needing mental health supports and/or SEL learning. Goals for the year include adding additional instruction in this area school-wide.

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

Using trend data from previous years (2018-2021), there are several areas that have been identified for improvement. In ELA, we experienced a 4 point drop in scale score for our 7th graders and a 6 point drop for our 8th graders. For Math, we experienced a 14 point drop in scale score for 7th graders and 29 point drop for 8th graders. The numbers of students scoring levels 1 also increased in all categories.

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

COVID19 has played a significant role in the learning loss experienced at DeLaura. Students have had countless disruptions to their learning that range from personal illness, remote learning,



quarantines and lack of consistent personnel during some months.

Actions to be taken include providing extensive support for tutoring and acceleration. Acceleration strategies will be utilized throughout the year which will include diagnosing missed learning, providing intense scaffolding during instruction, and focusing on priority standards. Teacher SIP teams and Department PLC's will be used to create action items for improvement.

Additionally, we have noticed an increase in students needed more mental health support and social emotional coping skills. New actions will include PD for staff focused on SEL learning and moving toward a "school-wide" approach to SEL learning.

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

One area of improvement was our student placement of level 3's into Algebra. Through creative scheduling, we provided our level 3 students, who were placed in Algebra, with a special cohort and master teacher to provide expert instruction. MAP growth of these identified students showed a positive trend from being given the extra support.

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

Factors that provided our level 3 Algebra students with satisfactory growth included creative scheduling, pairing them with a teacher who has a "growth mindset" for these students and providing extensive tutoring both in-person and virtual.

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

Acceleration strategies that we have planned for 2021-2022 include PD in the areas of scaffolding, extended student tutoring offerings (virtual and in-person), diagnosing missed learning through progress monitoring and prioritizing standards. Department PLC's and teacher SIP teams will be used to create action items centered around teaching strategies, school culture and faculty effectiveness.

#### **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.**

Focus areas for PD to staff include scaffolding practices, asset-based mindset for students and acceleration strategies. A teacher team has been created to develop and share resources related to our SIP and provide all faculty with research-based materials to facilitate accelerated learning.

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

Additional services that are planned include: Extended tutoring options for both virtual and in-person learners, increased access to technology through a "one to one" laptop initiative, accelerated learning strategies within classrooms and targeted credit/curriculum recovery options.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) will also be a focal point this year as we are still in the COVID19 pandemic. Students and staff will receive additional mental health instruction to mitigate the emotional difficulties of the pandemic. Staff will receive targeted PD as we move toward a whole school implementation of SEL learning and strategies.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data trends revealed that our students with disabilities still have an achievement gap as compared to general education peers. Data sets reviewed include FSA, MAP, Reading Inventory, Attendance and behavior to identify this need. DeLaura has the mindset that ALL students can learn and ALL students will reach mastery of the standards.

**Measurable Outcome:** ESE students will experience growth that meets or exceeds the state average in the following areas: FSA Math & FSA ELA

**Monitoring:** ESE students will be monitored through our Progress Monitoring systems (MAP & Reading Plus) 3 times per year in addition to real-time course based data. School staff will analyze specific ESE student data and provide research based interventions both inside the classroom and in acceleration opportunities. Department meetings and teacher SIP teams will be used to review ESE data as well.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Barna (barna.laura@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Department/Course PLC's - PLC's are utilized for each MESH subject to collaborate on key items such as: Standards based curriculum, student data chats, common assessment analysis and collective efficacy as a department. Google Forms will be used to collect PLC/ Department action items for implementation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We have been building on our Department PLC to further enhance their effectiveness. PLC's are research-based strategies that are utilized to analyze subgroup data, refine instructional strategies, share common assessment data and increase collective efficacy. Resources and criteria used for continuing this practice includes faculty surveys, department feedback and district guidance. The rationale for the strategy includes the ability for our staff, who are already collaborating, will have a more "laser like" focus on how to best use their time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- (1) Continue to implement PLC model at department meetings
- (2) Google Form will be used for feedback and data collection at each meeting. The Google Form contains targeted questions relating to Student Data, ESE supports, curriculum, common assessments and action steps to target identified students.
- (3) Admin will attend PLC's and model targeted strategies during the meeting
- (4) Google forms will be analyzed by the admin team to follow-up on targeted students and initiatives
- (5) identified students will be shared with classroom teachers to develop interventions and/or acceleration
- (6) PAR allocation will be used to add ESE support facilitation teachers

**Person Responsible:** Laura Barna (barna.laura@brevardschools.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data trends revealed that our African American students still have an achievement gap as compared to general education peers. Data sets reviewed include FSA, MAP, Reading Inventory, Attendance and behavior to identify this need. DeLaura has the mindset that ALL students can learn and ALL students will reach mastery of the standards.

**Measurable Outcome:** African American students will experience growth that meets or exceeds the state average in the following areas: FSA Math & FSA ELA

**Monitoring:** African American students will be monitored through our Progress Monitoring systems (MAP & Reading Plus) 3 times per year in addition to real-time course based data. School staff will analyze specific African American student data and provide research based interventions both inside the classroom and in acceleration opportunities. Department meetings and teacher SIP teams will be used to review demographic data as well.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Barna (barna.laura@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Department/Course PLC's - PLC's are utilized for each MESH subject to collaborate on key items such as: Standards based curriculum, student data chats, common assessment analysis and collective efficacy as a department.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We have been building on our Department PLC to further enhance their effectiveness. PLC's are research-based strategies that are utilized to analyze ESSA subgroup data, refine instructional strategies, share common assessment data and increase collective efficacy. Resources and criteria used for continuing this practice includes faculty surveys, department feedback and district guidance. The rationale for the strategy includes the ability for our staff, who are already collaborating, will have a more "laser like" focus on how to best use their time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- (1) Continue to implement PLC model at department meetings
- (2) Google Form will be used for feedback and data collection at each meeting. The Google Form contains targeted questions relating to Student Data, ESE/EW supports, curriculum, common assessments and action steps to target identified students.
- (3) Admin will attend PLC's and model targeted strategies during the meeting
- (4) Google forms will be analyzed by the admin team to follow-up on targeted students and initiatives
- (5) identified students will be shared with classroom teachers to develop interventions and/or acceleration
- (6) Utilize Dr. McKinnon to provide additional opportunities for our African American students

**Person Responsible** Laura Barna (barna.laura@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Overall in ELA we experienced a 4 point drop in scale score for our 7th graders and a 6 point drop for our 8th graders. In ELA, significant Gaps exist between our FRL & ESE population in comparison to our general education group. Looking at the trend data, there is a 20% point gap between our FRL and general education students on progress monitoring assessments. Additionally, there is an approximately 30% achievement gap between our ESE and general education scores. There are two subgroups where more support is needed.

**Measurable Outcome:** Since ELA/Literacy standards are encompassed in all subjects, DeLaura middle is aiming for an overall 5% increase in ELA achievement as a school. We are also aiming for improvements in the subgroups and ESE, FRL and key demographics to exceed the state average of improvement.

**Monitoring:** Focus areas for PD to staff include scaffolding practices, asset-based mindset for students and acceleration strategies. A teacher team has been created to develop and share resources related to our SIP and provide all faculty with research-based materials to facilitate accelerated learning. Monitoring will be achieved through classroom walkthroughs, team discussions and Reading inventories.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Barna (barna.laura@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Department/Course PLC's - PLC's are utilized for each MESH subject to collaborate on key items such as: Standards based curriculum, student data chats, common assessment analysis and collective efficacy as a department. Google Forms will be used to collect PLC/ Department action items for implementation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** For ELA, we will be using a variety of new resources that have been provided within the subject. ELA teams will have time to review, plan and implement the new curriculum while also utilizing other standards-based instructional practices. Our literacy coach will play a key role in modeling instruction and working with teachers to use effective instructional strategies and ELA resources.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We have been building on our Department PLC to further enhance their effectiveness. PLC's are research-based strategies that are utilized to analyze ESSA subgroup data, refine instructional strategies, share common assessment data and increase collective efficacy. Resources and criteria used for continuing this practice includes faculty surveys, department feedback and district guidance. The rationale for the strategy includes the ability for our staff, who are already collaborating, will have a more "laser like" focus on how to best use their time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**Areas of Focus: DeLaura was ranked "very high" in Property incidents. This data spike is due to the addition of cameras on campus and our ability to catch people who entered campus after hours. We will continue to monitor and ensure that all preventative measures are taken to keep unwanted persons off-campus after hours. A second area of focus includes the use and/or possession of vaping devices. We will continue to communicate anti-vaping and anti-tobacco measures campus and community wide.**

#### 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.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2021-2022 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and student survey called "youth truth". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment. As we are into the 3rd year of the pandemic, we are still finding evidence of learning loss and looking for new ways to combat it.

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school (83% yes), office staff at the school is helpful (96% yes) and a variety of comments relating to information being sent from the Principal to families. Several areas for improvement were identified from the parent survey: an Increase in parent/teacher communication, more resources relating to classroom assistance for parents and more technology resources to be used at home. Improvement planning for these areas include students being issued a school laptop to ensure that they can access rich curriculum from home and access online instructional modules.

Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for BPS in the following categories: Academic engagement, academic challenge and peer collaboration. These focus areas will be addressed with the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, forming instructional data teams to analyze results and also using specific teacher teams to share curriculum solutions school-wide.

Monthly department meetings will include specific action analysis of these standards and ensure that items are being addressed. Algebra teachers will be participating in the instructional data cycle to review student data and provide appropriate interventions as we look to improve our algebra placements with level 3's. The

Principal will host meetings with student leaders to gain valuable insight into the student culture and search for solutions to make improvements. The student group will be diverse in a variety of categories including FRL, ESE, demographics and other measures.

In our faculty survey, DeLauria was above the "Brevard Average" in 6 of the categories tracked by Insight. Areas of strength for this year included "Hiring Process", "Leadership", "Learning environment" and "School operations". Target areas for improvement included "Instructional planning for growth", "Professional development" and "Observation". Using this trend data, PD resources will be provided at every faculty meeting and department meeting to add instructional tools for our staff. We will have a specific teacher-based problem solving team that will address these key areas and they will meet monthly to provide solutions school-wide.

Additionally, we have added more mental health PD for our teachers to be aware of the issues our kids are facing. As a result of the pandemic, we have seen an increase in need for mental health supports for our students.

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

**Students** - Students will be responsible for modeling proper behavior for their peers and following all board policies. Additionally, student clubs will be provided to give students a "safe space" for their interests. Examples of student clubs planned for the year include, Diversity Club, Art Club, SGA, NJHS/BETA and many other groups for students to join. As long as students feel connected to the school, they will be more likely to succeed.

**Employees** - DeLauria employees will serve as role models for students both inside and outside the classroom. They will model positive traits that our students can emulate in their own actions. Teachers will also be responsible for providing standards-aligned instruction to students each day that will help them receive a quality education and become a positive member of society.

**Parents** - Parents will be provided excellent communication so they can provide the support at home. Parents will help facilitate proper behavior at home, reinforce academic skills, provide emotional support and receive resources to assist them.

**Business Partners** - Our many business partners will provide a key role in facilitating a variety of initiatives with either fiscal or human capital. Examples include student recognition ceremonies, faculty morale boosting events and support for academic resources.

**City government** - Our city will continue to provide a safe, vibrant city for our students to live in. We have partnered with them for several beautification projects and facility upgrades

**Community** - The community has a whole (all of the groups mentioned above) will work as a team to give our students the best environment possible to learn and grow as a person.