Thomas Jefferson Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Thomas Jefferson Middle School

1275 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.jefferson.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.

Thomas Jefferson Middle School's mission is to ensure that every student achieves at their maximum potential in an engaging and challenging learning environment in order to become productive citizens in today's society. (2020)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Academic and interpersonal success for all students (2020)

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
Trine, Meara	Principal	-Assist all academic teams in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to assist with developing and implementing targeted interventions for at-risk students -Review progress of SIP and give updates to SAC members at meetings -Review data monthly to determine student needs for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions -Work with ESE team to ensure all students' IEP needs are being met -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process
Kelly, Barbara	Assistant Principal	-Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students -Review progress of SIP and give updates to the SAC members at meetings and teacher teams -Review data monthly to determine student needs for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and discuss with teacher teams -Assists English Language Arts department in developing and implementing interventions for their at-risk students -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students -Work with ESE team to ensure that all students' IEP needs are being met and ESE push in schedules are meeting the minutes for each ESE student -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process and monitor all the student mentors to ensure they are meeting with their students
Harvey, Tiffany	Dean	-Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading interventions -Assists Reading department in developing and implementing interventions for their at-risk students -Assists with tracking attendance and behavior for at-risk students -Work with social workers to ensure at-risk students are being seen weekly by one of the social workers -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process
Clevenger, Jonell	Instructional Coach	-Assists all academic "teams" in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading interventions -Assists English Language Arts and Reading departments in developing nd implementing interventions for their at-risk students -Attend PLC meetings for all departments to address concerns of reading comprehension for at-risk students -Attend MTSS meetings to track all students ELA progress for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading interventions -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lerro, Beverly	School Counselor	-Assist all academic teams in identifying students suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions -Assist with tracking attendance for at-risk students -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process -Work closely with social workers to ensure at-risk students are developing relationships with guidance and social workers
Joca, Deborah	School Counselor	-Assists all academic teams in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions -Track student accomodations and behavior for all ESE students and students with BIPs -Work with ESE teacher team to ensure all students' IEP needs are being met -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process
Yates, Nancy	ELL Compliance Specialist	-Assist all academic teams in identifying candidates suitable for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions -Work with ELL students and teachers to ensure all students' needs are being met -Ensure all teachers working with ELL students are working towards their ESOL certification -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process
Diaz, Sandra	Administrative Support	-Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check-out process -Attend all SAC meetings and take minutes of meeting -Work with ELL students and parents to help with communication and translation to assist students with language barriers
Burgess, Tyler	Other	-Attend all MTSS meetings to address concerns of at-risk students -Work with at-risk students as a role model and mentor -Mentor at-risk students through the check-in/check out process

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.

We met with our SAC team members which consisted of parents, businesses, and community leaders. We also held meetings with our student leaders (SGA), our school leadership team, and our teachers/ staff to discuss areas of need, student data, and to obtain feedback and input to help develop the SIP goals and monitoring.

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 have established a regular monitoring schedule, which consists of weekly, monthly, quarterly, and semi-annual meetings with different stakeholder groups to ensure we are effectively impacting the achievement of our greatest achievement gaps of our students. As we continue to monitor the data throughout the year, we will meet with the stakeholders to revise and modify the SIP to make the greatest impacts of improvement in student learning. Progress toward the established goals will be tracked using data collection which will include PM1, PM2, and PM3 FAST testing, Algebra and Geometry progress monitoring, common assessments in our core classes, ALEKs data, Amplify data, reports generated in the Intensive Reading program, and stakeholder (student, parent, and teacher) survey data. This will include measuring overall student achievement and evaluating the reduction of the achievement gaps for targeted student groups.

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	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	59	35	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	45	73
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	61	107
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	37	91
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	72	74	146

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	45	48	93

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	2	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9

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	36	24	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	54	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	52	122
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	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	6	12	18

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	3	5	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6

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	36	24	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	54	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	52	122
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	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	6	12	18

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	3	5	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6

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*	53	50	50	63	59	54
ELA Learning Gains	45	43	48	58	56	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33	33	38	48	48	47
Math Achievement*	62	53	54	72	66	58
Math Learning Gains	50	49	58	51	55	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42	42	55	46	45	51
Science Achievement*	60	49	49	60	52	51
Social Studies Achievement*	79	72	71	78	75	72
Middle School Acceleration	77			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.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	30	Yes	3	1
HSP	54			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	49			

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	53	45	33	62	50	42	60	79	77			
SWD	20	29	27	24	35	31	32	56	50			
ELL	40	46		40	46							
AMI												
ASN	80			90								
BLK	26	27	17	29	25	25	33	57				
HSP	61	40	29	58	47	53	52	76	68			
MUL	45	41	33	57	59	50	58	92	76			
PAC												

| 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
WHT	54	47	35	65	51	40	63	79	77			
FRL	43	39	29	51	50	37	49	72	71			

| 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	56	47	32	63	41	42	58	75	79			
SWD	19	33	35	31	45	47	22	42	66			
ELL	54	62		64	57							
AMI												
ASN	70			90								
BLK	23	26	20	19	41	37	13	47				
HSP	47	37	17	54	38	32	44	62	62			
MUL	55	48	21	59	40	19	61	69	74			
PAC												
WHT	60	49	42	68	42	50	63	79	83			
FRL	48	46	35	52	42	41	47	66	72			

| 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	63	58	48	72	51	46	60	78	86			
SWD	25	42	36	36	37	36	20	47	60			
ELL	41	56	50	63	61							
AMI												
ASN	59	67		82	53				83			
BLK	30	40	25	33	32	33	33	69				
HSP	58	50	52	63	46	50	52	69	81			
MUL	68	57	64	73	51	30	65	83	91			
PAC												
WHT	66	59	49	76	52	50	63	79	87			
FRL	50	51	45	59	46	42	51	65	74			

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	57%	53%	4%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	52%	2%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	48%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	38%	11%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	44%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	51%	31%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	50%	40%	48%	42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	66%	12%

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.

The data unmistakably indicates that our Students with Disabilities constitute the subgroup with the lowest performance overall. In terms of English Language Arts (ELA) scores, they experienced a decline of 4% in overall learning gains compared to the previous year, while the lowest 25% saw an even steeper drop of 8%. In the realm of mathematics, these students exhibited a decrease of 16% in learning gains, and 16% decrease within the lowest 25%. Interestingly, this same subgroup displayed a remarkable learning gain of 10% in science and a noteworthy 14% increase in social studies.

Several factors contributed to these outcomes. Notably, one of the ELA teachers, who was entirely new to teaching, left the position after the first semester, leading to a substitute teacher handling the class for the entire second semester. This substitute lacked experience working with Students with Disabilities and was unfamiliar with differential instruction, small group teaching, and adapting the curriculum to cater to the students' needs. Additionally, another ELA teacher, who had previously taught only at the elementary level, faced a learning curve while adjusting to the new ELA textbook and working with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students.

Adding to the challenges, our most proficient ELA teacher, responsible for a significant number of our more disadvantaged ESE students, was on maternity leave for three months.

The improvements in our science and social studies can be attributed to the substantial expertise in ESE (Exceptional Student Education) possessed by each of those teachers, and no gaps in instruction throughout the year.

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

Compared to the previous year, our ELL subgroup has encountered a notable decline, exhibiting a 24% reduction in mathematical achievement and an 11% decrease in mathematics learning gains. This downward trend can be linked to the increase in our ELL population, coupled with their constrained proficiency in the English Language, which has played a contributory role. Furthermore, this particular subgroup faced challenges in ELA testing as well, demonstrating a 14% decrease in ELA achievement and an even steeper drop of 16% in learning gains.

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.

Our greatest gap is our African American students when compared to the state average.This sub group continues to struggle for three years now. This sub group scored 25.9% for level 3 and above compared to the district with 34.3% and the state at 36.2 for level 3 and above.

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

The bottom quartile of students within our multi-racial subgroup exhibited remarkable progress, particularly in mathematics, where they achieved an impressive growth of 31%. This subgroup also attained the highest collective advancement in ELA (English Language Arts) with a noteworthy increase of 12%. Furthermore, their performance in social studies achievement testing displayed a significant surge, demonstrating a remarkable rise of 23%.

Last year, we initiated a program designed to cater to students requiring additional assistance in mathematics. This initiative involved placing these students in smaller classroom settings, where they received supplementary support through collaborative efforts between the main teacher and an additional support teacher. To further bolster their progress, these students were actively encouraged to participate in morning school sessions, teacher tutoring sessions, and our ZTZ lunch program.

Every teacher collaborates extensively during PLC gatherings, focusing on data analysis, the creation of high-quality shared assessments, and, extensive discussions regarding assessment results along with strategies for both remedial and enrichment actions. in our mathematics classes, our teachers utilized the PBIS incentive system to acknowledge student achievements within the Aleks program. Furthermore, each teacher underwent training in Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures, designed to facilitate interdependent and collaborative student groups within the classroom setting.

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

Our primary focus revolves around two critical areas: absenteeism and the performance of our ELA level 1 students. The data underscores that 94 students are encountering challenges in maintaining regular attendance at school. To address this issue, our principal and social worker are dedicating their efforts this year to conduct home visits. Their objective is to provide support and motivation to these students, encouraging consistent attendance while also identifying and overcoming any obstacles that might be hindering their attendance.

To achieve this, we are utilizing our PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) system. Through this framework, we aim to establish effective incentives and foster strong connections with our students. This approach is designed to help them recognize the advantages of attending school regularly, fostering a positive environment that encourages engagement and participation.

Furthermore, we are dedicating significant attention to our students at ELA level 1. A primary area of interest revolves around their proficiency in literacy. Our Intensive Reading teacher will have a continuous partnership with our Literacy Coach throughout the academic year. Their collaborative efforts will be directed towards constructing a comprehensive curriculum. This curriculum will create a strong groundwork for the students, providing them with essential strategies to assist with their literacy abilities and nurture their overall educational growth. Our ELA team consists of experienced teachers who will closely collaborate with the Literacy Coach. Together, they will assess FAST data, shared common assessments and their results, and concentrate on implementing the Kagan Cooperative Learning Structure on a regular consistent basis in their classrooms.

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

Increasing the achievement levels in both ELA and math for our African American students.
Increasing the achievement levels in both ELA and math for our Students with Disabilities.
Increasing the achievement levels in both ELA and math for our ELL students.
Decrease absenteeism school-wide and for our EWS.
Enhance our PBIS program to incorporate more incentives and build solid relationships with the students.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

One critical area of focus for our school within the realm of early warning indicators for our students with disabilities and African American students is the cultivation of a positive culture and environment. It is imperative to create an inclusive and supportive atmosphere that fosters these students' sense of belonging, ability to succeed, and potential for self growth. This entails implementing strategies that address not only academic needs but also an emotional connection to their school community. Both our ESE population and our African American population are below the 41% Federal Index under the ESSA Federal Index data, By promoting a positive culture, encouraging student achievement, and providing targeted support services through our PBIS process, we can establish an environment where these students feel empowered to thrive. Such an approach not only enhances their academic engagement and achievement but also paves the way for lifelong success by instilling confidence, resilience, and a strong sense of identity.

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

By the end of our 2023-2024 school year, Jefferson Middle School will increase the student achievement of our lowest performing 25% of students by 5% on both the ELA and math state assessment.

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

A dedicated team comprising teachers, guidance counselors, administrators, and staff members will actively oversee the implementation of PBIS and MTSS, ensuring its intended outcomes are achieved. This team convenes on a monthly basis to assess behavioral data, gauge student engagement, evaluate absenteeism trends, track student performance, and strategize for comprehensive school-wide PBIS-focused initiatives. During these meetings a myriad of data sources are presented, analyzed, and utilized to develop interventions and supports. Data includes behavioral data (OSS, ISS, Discipline Referrals, Positive Referrals, BIP tracking, Threat Assessments, SRIs, etc.), academic data (grades, common assessment results, FAST, classroom walk through notes, etc.), attendance data (unexcused absences, tardies, truancy process, etc.), and more.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Meara Trine (trine.meara@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.)

PBIS stands as a multi-tiered, evidence-based model which aims to bolster and elevate both scholastic and behavioral outcomes across the entire student body. Its inception dates back to the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA), initially designed to assist students with disabilities. However, over time, this original focus evolved into a PBIS framework that caters to the needs of all students. Grounded in the principles of positive discipline, PBIS underscores the recognition of students' praiseworthy conduct. Employing a forward-looking methodology, PBIS proactively reinforces positive behavioral expectations through praise and incentives.

PBIS employs a three-tiered approach composed of evidence-based strategies: universal interventions, targeted interventions, and intensive individualized interventions.

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

PBIS establishes well-defined, school-wide expectations to bolster student achievement. Through its tiered support system, PBIS effectively reduces instances of disciplinary issues, suspensions, and absenteeism, while also fostering student motivation to excel. The detrimental impact of learning time lost due to suspensions, absenteeism, and behavioral problems underscores the importance of minimizing such disruptions for student learning.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Monthly meetings of the PBIS team will be conducted to assess data, create targeted professional development opportunities for teachers that center around enhancing student achievement, and create incentives that encourages the individual student and the entire school community.

Person Responsible: Jonell Clevenger (clevenger.jonell@brevardschools.org)

By When: The end of each month.

On the first day of school, a PowerPoint presentation will be disseminated to all classroom teachers to present to their students throughout the school day. Teachers will discuss with students the PBIS system, encompassing the concept of sand dollars as well as the array of rewards and incentives. Furthermore, each teacher will prominently display the daily incentives within their classrooms, utilizing them as points of reference during instructional time. Teachers are asked to write two positive referrals for every disciplinary referral. Systematic tracking of this data will occur, with special recognition during faculty meetings for the department creating the highest count of positive referrals. On a weekly basis, students will be announced during lunchtime with the positive referral and a frozen ice pop as their reward for making great decisions.

Person Responsible: Barbara Kelly (kelly.barbara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each week on Friday for the announcement of the positive referral. Monthly for the faculty meeting for teacher recognition.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

According to the data from FAST Progress Monitoring, both our students with disabilities and African American students face significant challenges in the field of mathematics. In the case of students with disabilities, there has been a notable 16% decrease in learning gains in math compared to the previous year. Similarly, our African American students also experienced a 16% decline in learning gains in this subject area too.

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 2023-2024 school year, Jefferson Middle School will increase the student achievement of our ESE and African American students by 5% or more on the mathematic school assessment.

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

Our entire team of core teachers has been equipped with training in the Kagan Cooperative Structure. The administrative staff will be actively engaged in the educational process by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs. These walkthroughs will serve the purpose of observing, coaching, and overseeing student engagement within the learning environment.

Furthermore, the administration will actively participate in Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings. During these meetings, there will be discussions centered around data analysis, involving teachers and administrators alike. The administration will also provide valuable support by sharing Kagan Structure concepts for implementation in the classroom. In addition, they will keep a close watch on student attendance and academic performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Kelly (kelly.barbara@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.)

Kagan Structures encompass instructional strategies grounded in scientific research. Their purpose is to foster cooperation and communication within the classroom, while also enhancing student confidence and sustaining their engagement in classroom interactions. Drawing from extensive research spanning decades, these structures integrate key principles that enhance both social skills and academic accomplishments.

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

Upon examination of school data, it revealed that our Students with Disabilities are facing significant challenges, particularly in core subjects like English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. It has been proven through research that conventional teaching approaches utilized by traditional classroom teachers always cater effectively to only a subset of students. Consequently, there continues to exist an achievement disparity among different groups of learners, including Students with Disabilities and African American students.

However, in cooperative classrooms, teachers are determined to close these achievement gaps, and they hold the expectation of elevated levels of learning for ALL students. To accomplish this goal, the

implementation of Kagan Structures will be utilized school-wide to ensure the active participation of every student within the classroom setting. By fostering comprehensive engagement in learning for all students, the closing of the achievement gap becomes more obtainable.

Notably, John Hattie's extensive research on visible learning underscores the potency of specific approaches. For instance, the Jigsaw method within a cooperative learning environment boasts an effect size of 1.20, while classroom discussions yield an effect size of .82. Both of these techniques, along with the incorporation of various additional Kagan Structures, will be integrated into the curriculum at JMS (name of the school/program). This integration is aimed at fostering an environment where every student can thrive academically.

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.

Every month, teachers will put into practice one Kagan Structure. They will invite administrators and colleagues into their classrooms to observe the structure in action.

Person Responsible: Barbara Kelly (kelly.barbara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Eech month.

Every professional development (PD) and faculty meeting will incorporate a Kagan Structure as a part of the meeting. This allows the faculty members to familiarize themselves with various structures that they can then apply in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Barbara Kelly (kelly.barbara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each month.

The Literacy Coach will demonstrate lesson plan modeling for both the ELA department and the Reading department. This demonstration will encompass various aspects including content delivery, classroom management, and student engagement. The goal is to contribute to the reduction of student absenteeism through enhanced student engagement strategies, while also providing guidance on implementing effective Kagan Structures.

Person Responsible: Jonell Clevenger (clevenger.jonell@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each week for the full school year.

The principal and social worker will collaborate closely to oversee instances of high absenteeism and conduct needed home visits. The PBIS team will maintain their monthly meetings to monitor these students, striving to create strong connections with both the students and their classroom teachers.

Person Responsible: Meara Trine (trine.meara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

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).

We will use school improvement funding for student needs as follows:

Tier 1 - School-wide Expectations: Clearly define and teach school-wide behavioral expectations, such as being respectful, responsible, and safe. Ensure these expectations are consistently enforced across all settings. We will create PBIS posters for all over campus as reminders for our students of our expectations and school culture.

Positive Referral Reinforcement: We will continue to Implement a system of rewards and recognition for students who consistently exhibit positive behaviors.

The Principal will speak on the PA system each morning to start the day with positive communication and friendly reminders for our school-wide expectations. This practice will contribute to fostering a positive atmosphere and a collective sense of responsibility among the student body.

Tier 2 - Targeted Interventions:

Check-In/Check-Out: We will assign a mentor to students who need extra support. They will check in with the student in the morning, set goals, and providing feedback.

Counseling Support: Collaborate with counselors to provide specialized support for students dealing with deeper emotional and behavioral challenges.

Check in with Social Worker weekly. Students will have a set appointment time to meet with the social worker to discuss, grades, behavior, absenteeism, sense of belonging, and motivation.

Tier 3 - Intensive Interventions:

Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA): When needed, we would conduct an FBA to identify the underlying causes of challenging behaviors and develop targeted intervention plans.

BIPs: Create highly individualized behavior plans that include specific strategies, supports, and consequences to address challenging behaviors.

Restorative Practices: The Dean will Implement restorative practices when necessary to rebuild/restore relationships with students and students/teachers as needed.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A