
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

John F. Kennedy Middle School

2100 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

John F. Kennedy Middle School is committed to achieving an educational standard of excellence for all students that will motivate and empower students to become lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The John. F. Kennedy Middle School community shares a commitment to education that challenges and motivates students to reach their highest potential.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Papczynski, Peter	Principal	Oversee all curriculum, facilities, security and school-related operations for Kennedy Middle School. Primary instructional leader of the building focused on faculty professional development, student achievement and community building. Perform teacher evaluations.
Davis, Tami	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. Perform teacher evaluations.
Irvine, Brian	Assistant Principal	Primarily responsible for student discipline process, including instruction for teachers in the implementation of discipline policies. Other areas of focus include faculty/staff performance evaluations, monitoring student attendance, enforce school board regulations, facilities responsibilities, security/drill management, threat assessment, and on-site safety programs.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Teachers, staff, and parents all provide input into the development of the KMS SIP. We provide opportunities at school events, review parent, student, and staff surveys for related data and input as we

craft our plan. Finally we publish the plan for feedback prior to completing and publishing the finished product.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We monitor our data after every related assessment windows- SRI testing, PMI 1, 2, 3 and all grade reporting windows. We follow up with departmental meeting and PLC's to review outcomes, discuss best practices and identify areas of strength and areas of focus.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	49	120	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	45	70	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	21	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	33	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	41	98	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	110	218	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	79	111	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	83	118	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	30	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days								108	110	218
One or more suspensions								8	25	33
Course failure in ELA								2	7	9
Course failure in Math								2	5	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								32	79	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								33	51	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								35	83	118

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	30	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	51	49	56	50	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				42			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			23		
Math Achievement*	71	55	56	63	33	36	67		
Math Learning Gains				59			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			42		
Science Achievement*	53	47	49	58	53	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	67	68	82	48	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	81	69	73	85	36	49	79		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					71	70			
ELP Progress	28	47	40	63	72	76	41		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	4	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	53			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	50			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			71			53	84	81			28
SWD	25			40			19	51			4	
ELL	57			58			43	73	65		6	28
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			55			14	80	71		5	
HSP	52			62			49	69	67		6	21
MUL	56			68			39	92	78		5	
PAC												
WHT	68			77			62	87	85		5	
FRL	53			60			43	76	67		6	31

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	56	42	28	63	59	41	58	82	85			63
SWD	13	32	31	20	36	30	13	58				
ELL	34	33	25	51	47	31	25	75	85			63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	28	19	30	40	28	29	50	82			
HSP	49	40	18	51	55	39	38	77	74			58
MUL	54	41	21	69	65	40	71	68	95			
PAC												
WHT	64	46	38	72	62	51	67	91	85			
FRL	41	37	24	51	54	39	42	69	78			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	48	23	67	53	42	58	77	79			41
SWD	24	26	18	25	37	37	23	31	50			
ELL	25	33	16	38	50	40	10	50				41
AMI												
ASN	82	67		91	52		79		80			
BLK	39	37	16	41	39	36	40	45	58			
HSP	49	42	17	60	53	37	50	65	81			43
MUL	74	53		70	53		68	90	86			
PAC												
WHT	62	51	27	73	55	47	61	84	80			
FRL	46	39	21	53	50	43	43	65	70			36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	47%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	47%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	48%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	38%	1%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	51%	34%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	50%	45%	48%	47%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	69%	13%	66%	16%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students with disabilities show the greatest need for improvement. They have underperformed in every academic area compared to their peers. There was also less growth in some areas for the achievement of

our African American subgroup.

Mobility, disengagement, lack of support structures outside of school, and historically low expectation have all impacted our students with disabilities. More academic support is warranted across the curriculum for this group.

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

Science was the area that showed the greatest decline. Turnover in the department, extended absences of teachers, and a lack of hands on inquiry lessons due to COVID requirements all combined for the decrease.

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

All of Kennedy's assessment data was higher than the state mean. The smallest area was Science which was 5 points above the state, The largest was in Geometry with KMS 34 points higher than the state mean. Very deliberate execution of high yield strategies, solid standards based instruction, utilization of school-wide AVID strategies, and placement of students in the most rigorous classes combined to yield impressive gains for KMS across the curriculum.

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

7th and 8th grade Math both showed a 14 point gain for our most improved data components. To improve outcomes we place students in the highest level math data indicates they can be successful, we provide a robust system of academic support, math teachers collaborate and utilize professional development time to review data and refine practices. Finally we schedule an extra support elective on a needs basis for students to receive extra support in math. The class is after their math class so they can receive support with assignments and minimize any points of confusion about classwork and assignments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern continues to be SWD not showing academic growth at the same rate as the general population.

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

Our highest priority is closing the achievement gap for our students with disabilities.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Ensure greater level of support for ESE students to ensure on grade level work. Simply removing the barriers that have been erected against access to high level courses in and of itself is not sufficient to improve readiness and performance. Students from low-income and minority backgrounds too often have academic and social deficits and need a set of academic and social support mechanisms to help them navigate the challenges of rigorous courses and gain access to the same opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In order to meet ESSA goal of 41% proficiency, a 12% increase between PM1 and PM3 ELA FAST scores will occur.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School data will be monitored from reading assessments and FAST progress monitoring data to track progress towards our goal for students with disabilities. Progress will be determined through the use of classroom walk-throughs, PLC's agendas and minutes which include the use of WICOR strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthening the rigor of courses taken in middle and high schools can be an effective strategy to raise student achievement levels, and ensure post secondary and work readiness for more students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Help teachers design high-quality work and teach in ways that engage students, cause them to persist, and result in student satisfaction and acquisition of knowledge, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.

Help

teachers use a variety of instructional strategies and settings that identify and accommodate individual learning needs and engage students. Make sure that each student has a personal plan for progress that is reviewed often and ensures that students are engaged in an effort to meet high standards

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Ensure staff participate in all available professional development beginning with summer months inclusive of New Teacher Academy here at KMS as well as all induction and mentoring programs available.
2. Schedule resource teachers to support and ensure alignment with use of resources and curriculum and guides from BPS.
3. Schedule more sections of support courses for teachers trained to support struggling students.
4. Provide additional curriculum resources to support students growth in areas where they are struggling to perform.
- 5: Teachers will utilize Universal Design for Learning strategies in accordance with AVID WICOR strategies in order to engage students in all subject areas.
- 6: Using common assignments and assessments, the ESE teachers will be able to guide instruction and address deficiencies and areas needing remediation.
7. Teachers meet biweekly in PLC's in order to use data for instruction, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)

By When: December 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2023-2024 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, a student survey called "youth truth," and faculty surveys like "Insight." These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

Our Parent survey included positive responses in most categories including: feeling welcome by office staff,

feeling staff are polite and helpful in answering questions or concerns. The Parent survey also identified Academic Support as the most desired engagement resource but also identified a need for more mental health resources.

The Youth Truth Survey completed by students indicated academic challenge and engagement to be our highest rated dimensions. Belonging and Peer Collaboration and Relationships tied as our second most positive responses.

To better serve our stakeholders, we will be increasing the budget for our Academic Support Program to provide more support and resources to students and parents. We will be adding more subject areas and more opportunities for academic support.

We will implement research based SEL curriculum to provide targeted instruction to help provide mental health information. We will utilize a grant funded counselor to work with identified students and small groups. We will continue to foster our relationships with agencies that can provide outside counseling to our students and families.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will review school-wide parent, and staff surveys to evaluate our growth. Specifically we will monitor the responses to indicate parents and students are satisfied and/or highly satisfied. We will increase the number of students served with academic support programs to include a minimum of 15% of our enrollment. Additionally the budget for Academic Support Programs will reflect our commitment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor all school-wide surveys to confirm we are making improvement in the areas indicated above and that no additional areas of concern emerge. Additionally we will monitor the number of permission forms to participate in academic support as well as require attendance logs to monitor the number of students participating.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami Davis (davis.tami@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence will include survey results and participation logs. The Academic Support Budget will also serve as evidence of this commitment

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the New Leader's Journal, when a school community collectively feels cared for and valued, great things happen. Students are more engaged, and they take more intellectual risks. Educators and

staff are more trusting and candid, not only with one another but with the people who they look to as leaders. They openly share their perspectives and help to shape school-based decisions. Parents feel more confident in the value of engaging with their school and play an active role in their child(ren)'s education. When school leaders create the conditions in which everyone in the school community feels valued, they can drive significant improvements in students overall academic achievement, behavior, and attendance—as well as teacher satisfaction and retention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School Improvement funding allocations are reviewed and approved by Kennedy's School Advisory Committee. The members of this committee represents staff, parents and community representatives elected during our open house. Expenditure requests are presented, discussed and reviewed by this group for approval.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

KMS shares its SIP at school-wide school events to all stake holders. We provide opportunities for feedback and input any time we host stakeholders on our campus.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction. Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material").

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Teachers in PLCs and the MTSS team meet weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom.

The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: • Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data • Student work is displayed throughout school • All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum. The administration ensures

that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team

actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume

leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is

rooted in data on student progress and interests.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA