Andrew Jackson Middle School

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

college and career

ambitious

mission

school improvement

family and community involvement

striving   achievement

teaching   relationships

needs assessment

success   resources   areas of focus

instruction

strategic planning   collaboration   vision   learning   supportive environment   growth

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Andrew Jackson Middle School

1515 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to providing a culture of learning, emphasizing high expectations for all students, staff, and parents while creating an environment where students feel supported and become critical thinkers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Andrew Jackson Middle School is committed to inspiring and empowering students to excel both academically and socially, while preparing them to be productive citizens and future leaders.

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
Shockley, Jennifer	Principal	Duties consist of overseeing all school personnel. Facilitates essential school meetings and solves major concerns that may present themselves. Provides guidance to all faculty and staff when needed or requested. Establishes a progress monitoring plan which involves all essential instructional school leaders and teachers.
Rosado, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Primary duties are to provide support and assure the implementation the state curriculum. Also provides and oversees many other responsibilities such as scheduling, planning events, and heading communications with parents and other stakeholders. Assisting the principal when needed, provides support in all fashions for the entire school.
Thomas, Batina	Dean	Assistant Principal and our Dean of Discipline the primary responsibilities include processing all referrals and conducting all disciplinary investigations, including Title IX. Responsible for attendance data, failures due to attendance, and student activities. Assisting the principal when needed, provides support in all fashions for the entire school.
Porter, Rebeca	Parent Engagement Liaison	Dr. Porter works with our community and business partners to coordinate and plan family engagement activities and events.
Guadagna, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Primary duties are to provide literacy support for all classrooms. Responsible for facilitating professional development training sessions, helping to provide teachers with instructional literacy techniques/strategies and ways to implement the instructional practices. Maintains a school-wide resource drive providing helpful literacy documents, various important information/data, and provides feedback when needed.
Mancini, Teresa	Instructional Coach	Primary duties are to provide math support for all classrooms. Responsible for facilitating professional development training sessions, helping to provide teachers with instructional literacy techniques/strategies and ways to implement the instructional practices. Maintains a school-wide resource drive providing helpful mathematical resources, various important information/data, and provides feedback when needed.

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.

During the summer student achievement data was reviewed by the school leadership team. Then during pre-planning the data was shared with faculty and staff. Each department then review their own subject area data to develop a plan for improvement. Parents, business partners, and community leaders are all

part of our School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC provided input to the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and then approved the SIP prior to submission. The SIP is reviewed monthly during both SAC meetings and faculty meetings and is updated and modified as needed throughout the year. In addition, the SIP is posted to the school website and is updated if changes are made during the year. Throughout the year, the SIP is also reviewed with parents and community members during our family engagement events.

Parent survey data showed that only 6% of our parents participated in a meeting or an event monthly to support their child's academic success. 66% of parents attended once/twice a year and 28% stated that they never attended an event. Student survey data showed that 45% of our students felt that the work they do for their classes really makes them think. Teacher survey data showed that only 32% of teachers felt that students support their answers and explain their thinking.

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))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through the use of classroom walkthrough data. In addition, departments will meet twice a monthly to discuss implementation and effectiveness of the plan by analyzing student achievement data and incorporating effective instructional strategies. Members of the department will collaborate on lesson planning to include the action steps outlined in the SIP. While discussing student achievement, each department will also focus on our underperforming subgroups including students with disabilities (SWD) and African American (AA) students. Department Chairs will meet monthly with administration to discuss implementation of the SIP and progress towards the SIP goals.

We will monitor the impact of the SIP on student achievement in Reading and Math through the use of FAST progress monitoring data three times a year. We will also review the results of common assessments in each department to monitor progress. In addition, our struggling readers will participate in the Scholastic Reading Inventory three times a year for us to monitor their growth and progress.

Throughout the school year as we monitor the effectiveness of implementation and the impact on student achievement each month, we will make any necessary revisions. As we focus on continuous improvement, if we are not seeing effective implementation or the impact we want on student achievement, we will modify and adapt the plan. In addition, we will review our annual student, teacher, and parent survey data to monitor the effectiveness of implementation.

Demographic Data	
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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	95%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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	2021-22: C 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	86	26	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	55	131
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	44	66
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	40	134
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	43	174
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	151	83	234

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	104	66	170

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	28	13	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	32

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	50	52	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	26	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	26	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	71	118
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	79	137
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	113	136	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	156	162	318

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	12	22	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	52	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	26	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	26	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	71	118
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	79	137
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	113	136	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	156	162	318

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	12	22	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	21

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	50	50	60	59	54
ELA Learning Gains	40	43	48	60	56	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31	33	38	48	48	47
Math Achievement*	41	53	54	69	66	58
Math Learning Gains	39	49	58	61	55	57

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33	42	55	43	45	51
Science Achievement*	50	49	49	50	52	51
Social Studies Achievement*	65	72	71	79	75	72
Middle School Acceleration	54			86		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				

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%
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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)

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	43	40	31	41	39	33	50	65	54			
SWD	11	26	25	16	24	26	24	26	25			
ELL	23	33		43	64							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	28	26	19	31	26	27	41	36			
HSP	41	38	31	32	44	40	51	65	48			
MUL	41	36		44	40		48	94	55			
PAC												
WHT	52	45	35	51	40	36	55	72	58			
FRL	33	35	32	33	37	33	42	56	47			

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	47	47	30	51	43	41	50	63	68			
SWD	14	26	23	15	38	38	14	26				

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
ELL	45	82		70	40							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	33	26	25	32	40	20	37	47			
HSP	51	53	40	49	41	29	50	67	58			
MUL	53	52		61	56		67	70	83			
PAC												
WHT	53	50	30	60	45	40	61	71	71			
FRL	38	40	29	42	40	44	38	54	61			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	60	60	48	69	61	43	50	79	86			
SWD	26	48	42	28	44	33	22	51				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83	58		92	75				100			
BLK	35	43	44	44	50	38	20	56	58			
HSP	48	60	53	63	55	38	42	71	84			
MUL	61	56	50	70	60	33	42	87	100			
PAC												
WHT	71	67	51	77	65	52	65	85	87			
FRL	49	55	46	58	56	41	35	74	75			

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	56%	53%	3%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	48%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	33%	38%	-5%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	44%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	51%	14%	50%	15%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	50%	25%	48%	27%

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	75%	69%	6%	66%	9%

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.

Our lowest performing components were Math, ELA, and Science. With both Math and ELA proficiency being at a 51% and Science at 46%. Our SWD and African American students are performing below the federal index, with 19% achievement in Math and 17% in ELA of our SWD, and 26% in Math and 31% in ELA of our African American students.

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

The only component to show a decline was Science, with a 4% drop from 50% to 46%. Possible factors that may have contributed to the decline could be that two of the four teachers were new teachers, and a third teacher was on leave for the first semester of the school year.

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.

None of our components performed lower than the state average overall. However, our SWD and African American subgroups are performing significantly lower than the state average with SWD math achievement at 19% ELA at 17% and African American students' math achievement at 26% and ELA at 31%.

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

The component with the most improvement was ELA, specifically 7th grade with a 13% increase from 43% to 56%. The factors that contributed the most was the district content specialist consistently meeting with our ILA & ELA teachers with an establish progress monitoring plan, along with the added support of our Literacy Coach who came onboard during the third quarter and established routine and rigor with all ELA & ILA classes.

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

In reviewing our EWS data, an area of great concern is the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency. The 234 students listed represent 40% of the student body. This is a great impediment to the achievement of students and must be addressed with appropriate strategies and instructional planning.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
3. SWD in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

ELA proficiency was at a 51%. Our SWD and African American students are performing below the federal index, 17% in ELA of our SWD, 31% in ELA of our African American students.

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

Overall, ELA proficiency-base line will increase to 60%
SWD and African American proficiency base line will increase by 10%

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

Classroom walkthroughs.
Data tracking by teacher by period.
Departments meet bi-monthly to collaborate and review data to inform instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Guadagna (guadagna.theresa@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.)

ELA evidenced based strategies:
Use Scaffolded Supports
Use Explicit Instruction
Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement
Targeted small instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of scaffolded supports will narrow the gap between our students with disabilities and African American subgroups who are in need of remediation and interventions.
Explicit provides modeling, verbalizing with clarity, opportunities of practices, and feedback to promote with data collection.
Kagan training for teachers to promote active student engagement and increase student motivation and confidence.
With the support of our Literacy Coach small group instruction will be targeted to our subgroups with the highest needs.

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.

Identify lowest quartile students as well as underperforming SWD and African American students.
Identify general education classroom teachers and support facilitators who will collaborate and work in tandem to provide support.
Ensure general education classroom teachers and support facilitators are fully trained on curriculum resources and instructional delivery.
General education classroom teachers and support facilitators will receive training on Kagan strategies.
Case managers and teachers will track student progress and update student IEPs as needed.
Case managers will also inform parents, guidance, and AP of any student academic concerns.
Teachers will conduct student data chats at least twice per month.
Walk-throughs will be conducted by Admin and literacy coach with feedback provided directly to teachers.
District resource teachers will meet with teachers to analyze data, develop action steps, and provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rosado (rosado.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: August thru April monthly meetings held for updates and progress reports.

#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.

Research repeatedly has demonstrated that suspension, expulsion, and other punitive consequences are not the solution to disruptive and dangerous student behaviors and building a positive school culture for students. Research shows that frequent punitive consequences:
· Do not increase school safety.
· Relies too heavily on suspension and expulsion.
· Are related to increased rates of school dropout and discriminatory (minority and SWD) application of school discipline.
· Negatively impact minority students and SWD to a greater degree than other students.
· Restricts access to appropriate education, often exacerbating the problems of SWD and achievement difficulties.

Based on discipline data from school year 2022-23, Andrew Jackson's referrals were 1,802 written. The highest referral areas were During School Hours 1,752 with 1,010 (58%) for 7th grade and 742 (42%) for 8th grade; Location (classroom) 1,171 with750 (64%) for 7th grade and 421 (36%) for 8th grade; Location (hallway) 248 with 124 (50%) for 7th grade and 124 (50%) for 8th grade; Possible Motivation (avoid tasks and Activities) 349 with 215 (62%) for 7th grade and 134 (39%) for 8th grade; Possible Motivation (obtain peer attention) 455 with 315 (69%) for 7th grade and 140 (31%) for 8th grade.

Research-based positive discipline strategies that focus on increasing desirable behaviors instead of simply decreasing undesirable behaviors through punishment have more successful outcomes. They emphasize the importance of making positive changes in the student's environment in order to improve the student's behavior. Such changes may entail the use of positive reinforcement, modeling, supportive teacher-student relationships, family support and assistance from educational and mental health specialists.

Research shows that school culture has a high effect on a student's academic achievement. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Restorative Practices, and strong teacher-student relationships that are culturally responsive frameworks that use prevention and intervention activities to promote a safe school climate and positive academic and behavioral student outcomes. In an effort to raise student performance for our students, specifically SWD and African American student populations, we will implement more consistent PBIS and Restorative Practices, along with building relationships with our student population.

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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, Andrew Jackson Middle School will decrease the number of disciplinary referrals written by 20% BPS average info (?).

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

Our Student Success Team (SST) and PBIS team made up of teachers, administration, and other staff, will monitor the desired outcome. The PBIS team will meet once a month to analyze behavior data, discuss teacher participation, and plan quarterly PBIS events. The SST will meet bi-weekly to discuss student behavior that directly impacts school culture and climate, grades, and attendance and plan for interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebeca Porter (porter.rebeca@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.)

School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SW-PBIS) is a multi-tiered prevention framework guiding the implementation and sustainability of evidence-based interventions to meet the academic, behavior and socio-emotional needs of all students. Restorative Practices is a framework and approach to building culture and relationships within a community that establishes strong social networks and establishes norms for positive behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe how schools implementing PBIS Tier I supports and Restorative Practices for all students prevent the development and/or exacerbation of behavior challenges, increase the occurrence of pro-social skills and enhance the overall school culture.

The use of school-wide, targeted group and individual student outcome and fidelity data is used for decision-making and action planning.

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.

· PBIS team will meet monthly to analyze data, design PD and create positive incentives for individuals and school wide.
· Staff will be trained the use Restorative Practices, specifically implementing the use of Restorative Circles bi-weekly with students experiencing socially inappropriate behaviors.
· Continue using STAR Expectations in each classroom and school wide.
· Review PBIS incentive program and token economy. STAR Expectations will be shared during 7th grade orientation, and Homeroom during the first days of school.
· Create expectations for the use of our Positive Referrals system.
· SST to meet weekly to discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on behavior, academic, and attendance data.
· Track BIP's to ensure teachers are meeting the needs of our students and bring concerns to SST meetings.
· Utilize the Check-in Check-out for Tier 2 students to meet the needs of individual students.

Person Responsible: Batina Thomas (thomas.batina@brevardschools.org)

By When: Action steps will be monitored monthly throughout the year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Math proficiency was at a 51%. Our SWD and African American students are performing below the federal index, 19% in math of our SWD, 26% in math of our African American students.

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

Overall, math proficiency-base line will increase to 60%
SWD and African American proficiency base line will increase by 10%

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

Classroom walkthroughs.
Data tracking by teacher by period.
Departments meet bi-monthly to collaborate and review data to inform instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Mancini (mancini.teresa@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.)

Math evidenced based strategies:
Use Scaffolded Supports
Use Explicit Instruction
Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement
Targeted small instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of scaffolded supports will narrow the gap between our students with disabilities and African American subgroups who are in need of remediation and interventions.
Explicit provides modeling, verbalizing with clarity, opportunities of practices, and feedback to promote with data collection.
Kagan training for teachers to promote active student engagement and increase student motivation and confidence.
With the support of our Literacy Coach small group instruction will be targeted to our subgroups with the highest needs.

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.

Identify lowest quartile students as well as underperforming SWD and African American students.
Identify general education classroom teachers and support facilitators who will collaborate and work in tandem to provide support.
Ensure general education classroom teachers and support facilitators are fully trained on curriculum resources and instructional delivery.
General education classroom teachers and support facilitators will receive training on Kagan strategies.
Case managers and teachers will track student progress and update student IEPs as needed.
Case managers will also inform parents, guidance, and AP of any student academic concerns.
Teachers will conduct student data chats at least twice per month.
Walk-throughs will be conducted by Admin and literacy coach with feedback provided directly to teachers.
District resource teachers will meet with teachers to analyze data, develop action steps, and provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rosado (rosado.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: August thru April monthly meetings held for updates and progress reports.

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).

To assist in our school improvement efforts, we have district support from our content area resource teachers. The secondary ELA and secondary math resource teachers meet with our teachers to help them analyze data and develop a plan of action. In addition, the resource teachers conduct walkthroughs with the administration to provide feedback to improve instructional practices.

The district also provides support for our students with disabilities. New ESE teachers participate in several professional develop sessions to increase the effectiveness of their support for our ESE students. We also have the support of our ESE support specialist and behavior analyst as needed for our students.

Our ELL students are provided supports from each of their teachers as well as through the district. Teachers are trained in how to differentiate for ELL students and how to provide instructional accommodations. In addition, all ELL students have access to the program Imagine to help them with their language acquisition.

All students participate in our ZTZ (Zero Tolerance for Zeros) program twice a month. During homeroom, students are provided the opportunity to complete missing assignments, take tests, or receive academic support from their teachers.

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.

The SIP is shared and reviewed with staff during our monthly faculty meetings. It is also reviewed at our monthly SAC meetings. Our SIP is shared with parents at our annual Open House night, Title I Annual Meeting (T1), and during our Family Engagement activities(T1) throughout the year. We have our SIP posted to our school and district webpage for community members and local businesses to review. As we progress monitor our SIP throughout the year, the SIP will be updated and shared so that all stakeholders are aware of our progress. The SIP can be accessed at https://www.brevardschools.org/JacksonMS.

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))

We plan to focus on building positive relationships with parents by inviting them to be an integral part of their child's education. During our Open House and Annual Title I meeting (T1) families are invited to meet with teachers and staff to work together in developing a plan for success for their student. In addition, faculty and staff reach out to parents to personally invite them to join in the conversation about what is best for their child and how can we support them in their pursuit of success. Family engagement activities (T1) are provided to provide families with some tools and resources to support their student. AJMS also collaborates with several community business partners that support our families and staff in building positive relationships and providing support. Since FOCUS is the main method of communicating student progress with families, we have made it a priority to have every family have an active FOCUS account. Our parent liaison works with parents daily on a one-on-one basis to help them through process of creating a FOCUS parent account. In addition, our district ESOL parent liaisons help our families either at school or at their home through this process. Our faculty and staff use the Talking Points app to communicate with our families who's primary language is not English. Our Family Engagement Plan (T1) can be found our our school webpage at https://www.brevardschools.org/JacksonMS.

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))

We plan in strengthen our academic achievement by focusing on ELA and Math instruction. Student achievement is increased by the implementation of research-based high quality instructional strategies. All faculty and staff attending Kagan Cooperative Structures training (T1) prior to school beginning. By implementing these cooperative structures in the classroom, students will have an increase in the amount of quality learning time due to an increase in engagement during the lesson. We conduct common assessments in our MESH classes to monitor progress throughout the year. This data is then used to inform our instruction as we work towards student mastery of the standards. Our teachers focus on the grade level standards and provide targeted scaffolds as needed so that all students can be successful. This year we have added an additional guidance counselor (T1), a math coach (T1), and a Parent Liaison (T1) to help support the academic success of all our students.

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))

AJMS has developed our SIP with the consideration of other resources and programs. We are a Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) school so all of our students receive free breakfast and lunch everyday. We have district support for our students in foster care and our students in transition. Along with our two school counselors (T1), we also have a social worker to provide emotional and behavioral support to all students. Our parent liaison (T1) helps support our students that struggle with attendance. The district has parent liaisons for our ESOL students who support our ESOL families. We also provide all students the opportunity to participate in our career and technical education programs such as culinary, business, and technology.