Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

North

Jefferson Middle School

Area:

Principal:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

Area Superintendent:

Sherri Bowman

SAC Chairperson:

Charles Parker

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Jefferson Middle School will serve our community and enhance students' lives by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of dedication, collaboration, and learning.

Vision Statement:

To empower, nurture success, and pursue excellence for all students.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONALE – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

In an analysis of three-year data from FCAT and FCAT 2.0, a few salient themes emerged. Although there has been a decrease in percentage of students scoring at a level 3 or higher in both reading and math, there has been an increase in learning gains in reading. The data support the efficacy of the literacy initiatives we have put in place in the past three years primarily aimed at improving the skills and abilities of our lowest-performing students, such as the use of student data chats and weekly intervention time. At this point, we need to continue these efforts while also addressing other needs that have come to the forefront. Specifically, the decreased percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics (especially those in the lowest 25%) indicates a need for a different intervention than has been used in previous years. Additionally, the decrease in students scoring at a level 3 or higher across all tested areas demonstrates a need for overall improvement in reading, learning, and thinking in the content areas. This is true across school demographics, but particularly true with many of our subgroups (English Language Learners, Black and Hispanic Students, and Students with Disabilities). Our School-Based Objective and subsequent action steps are designed to address those needs.

School Year	% at Level 3 or Higher in Reading	% at Level 3 or Higher in Math	% Meeting the Writing Standard	% at Level 3 or Higher in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math
2011-2012	73	76	78	74	67	68	63	52
2010-11	81	91	92	76	60	78	60	75
2009-10	85	91	94	73	68	83	58	80

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

Jefferson's faculty is organized into academic teams, each with a common team planning. Each academic teacher also

has a common department planning. Teachers in each department utilize District pacing guides to assure alignment of their instructional delivery across the grade level. Department members meet on a regular basis with administration to ensure their curriculum is aligned vertically throughout the school and in coordination with our feeder chain. Lessons are developed in all academic areas to align with Florida's Sunshine State Standards and, in many cases, the Common Core State Standards.

Teachers begin with the end in mind: What do they want their students to know, understand, and be able to do? What will be accepted as evidence of mastery? What will they do if their students have not learned it yet, or if they learn it faster than anticipated? These questions drive lesson planning and development.

Teachers are asked to revise lesson plans annually. Jefferson's master schedule is designed to allow time for teachers to meet during the school day in academic teams and/or departments. This provides an excellent opportunity for professional growth and development as teachers share their successes and challenges. Reflection of teaching practices is key (York-Barr, Reflective Practice to Improve Schools) to school-wide improvement. Jefferson's teachers are encouraged to take the time to evaluate their own teaching strategies to determine if they are focusing on high-yield strategies, and if not, how to correct this situation. Instructional focus is monitored on a continual basis through the use of a data room that contains progress monitoring boards for each FCAT- tested subject.

Each academic discipline employs common assessments so we can accurately measure progress. These assessments are the major topic of discussion in our Professional Learning Communities as teachers discover what is working and what is not. Administration supports this effort by providing time during the school day to meet and requiring the implementation of B.E.S.T. teaching practices. Administrators use the Classroom Walkthrough process to monitor instructional strategies in the building.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

Jefferson students have the opportunity to participate in extended learning opportunities through a variety of programs. These include the Academic Support Program, before and after school tutoring, and enrichment opportunities.

Academic Support Program (ASP)
Eligible students, those who are not performing satisfactorily in any core subject and/or have scored at a Level 1 or 2 on FCAT 2.0, will have opportunities for additional instruction in mathematics, language arts, and science. ASP for each subject will be staggered so that students in need of support in multiple areas will have the opportunity to participate. ASP will be offered for 20 weeks, two days a week, before and after school for one hour. Students scoring Level 1 or 2 on FCAT will be the priority for language arts or math support. Students in the lowest 25% or who need additional support will also be a priority group. Small group, explicit instruction will be given by
certified teachers, focusing on a review of the FCAT 2.0 strands and testing strategies. Materials used for instruction will include research- based, district- approved textbooks and workbooks, including any appropriate computer-based programs.

Enrichment Opportunities
Jefferson offers students opportunities to participate in several clubs during and after school. Opportunities for SOAR remediation are based on District guidelines and available funding. Last summer any student who failed an academic class was notified of his/her eligibility for SOAR (eLearning Lab).

Upon entrance, Jefferson identifies students who are permitted to receive enrichment through Gifted services. These students receive gifted enrichment every school day, in an academic class and a homeroom class taught by

teachers who are either gifted endorsed or in the process of obtaining endorsement. Students not placed in the gifted program are singled out for enrichment based on their progress in their core academic subjects. If they are able to master the course content, their teacher provides enrichment activities to further and extend their exploration of the subject. This differentiated instruction is a key focus of our Gifted services program. All academic teams promote enrichment in reading through Reading Counts and school wide reading programs.

Teachers utilize differentiated instruction to ensure they are meeting students at their level of need. Lessons are differentiated on the basis of content, product, process, or learning environment (Tomlinson, The Differentiated Classroom). Differentiation allows students to delve deeper into subject material.

Jefferson utilizes an innovative FLEX schedule to provide an exceptional selection of enrichment activities to our students during the school day. Each week, we hold an extended homeroom period for forty-five minutes. We use the time for school-wide intervention for struggling students. Students at or above proficiency in their classes are provided enrichment activities in their homeroom class. We are also working vigorously to incorporate components of the 21st Century classroom by adding technological resources for our teachers. These audio/video resources provide a tremendous benefit to students and facilitate instruction.

Our reading and math remediation programs are supported through the use of computer labs, pullout programs and computer-based programs. Jefferson offers parents and students access to Edline for progress updates and to enhance instruction and communication.

CONTENT AREA:

x Reading	x Math	x Writing	x Science	x Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
x Language Arts	x Social Studies	x Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Jefferson Middle School will improve academic achievement for all students by developing school-wide awareness of the Common Core State Standards and implementing close reading of complex text across the content areas.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Not having a clear understanding of the CCSS and what will be expected of students	Begin unpacking standards to determine what students should Know, Understand and be able to Do as demonstration of mastery of CCSS	In-house CCSS experts MESH departments	Ongoing	$100	● Surveys ● Attendance logs ● KUD language in the classroom (via common board figuration)
2. Teacher buy-in that all students can do this	● Administer survey ● Supply sample units / lessons for close reading exercises ● Literacy coach to model lessons	Administration Teacher Leaders	Ongoing	-----	● Surveys ● Teacher reflections ● Formative assessment via conversation

3. Not knowing how to identify complex text appropriate to the content / task	• Review rubric on text complexity from CCSS in faculty and team meetings • Identify existing resources from textbooks, Appendix B, etc.	Language Arts / Reading Department Literacy Coach Guidance Services Professional	By December 15, 2012	-----	●Completed rubrics during faculty meetings ●Lesson plans to include using complex text in class
4. Degree of challenge of complex text for our Level 1 and 2 students	Look at MESH handbooks and see what strategies would be most appropriate for scaffolding lessons	Administration Reading Department Literacy Coach	By December 15, 2012	-----	●Formative Assessment ●FAIR data
5. Lack of professional development in close reading, close reading strategies, and how these apply across the content areas	Provide professional development on what close reading is and how to ask meaningful, text-dependent questions	Guidance Service Professional, Literacy Coach, in-house experts	Ongoing	$100	●Surveys ●Exit slips ●Lesson plans by teachers documenting use of CCSS strategies

6. Lack of understanding in how to assess students' mastery of CCSS across the content areas	As departments unpack standards, they will come to an initial consensus on what students need to Know, Understand, and be able to Do to demonstrate mastery of CCSS	Department Chairs Teachers	Ongoing	-----	● Common Assessments ● Department Meeting Minutes ● Lesson Plans / Revised Approaches for 2012-2013 ● Teachers provide assignments that require students write responses with detailed / specific support from the text.

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Helping all students comprehend text – especially nonfiction text – has always been a challenge. In an attempt to make texts more approachable to students, we have sometimes inadvertently made it *too* easy to comprehend through the use of lower-Lexile materials, extensive pre-reading activities, teachers reading aloud full pieces of text, etc. While we have no intention of simply presenting students with challenging text for them to learn from without teacher scaffolding, we do need a paradigm shift in terms of how to choose and use complex text across the content areas.

For our first year, there are three outcomes we want to see:

1. Increased comfort with and confidence in the purposeful, *select* use of complex text in content area classes.

In a study of over a half million students ("Reading: Between the Lines," published by American College Testing; ACT; 2006), differences in student performance on the American College Testing (ACT) assessment was not determined by question type (e.g., inferential vs. literal) *but on the level of text complexity.* Text difficulty is at the heart of the Common Core State Standards and is what we most need to start understanding as educators.

2. Briefer, more strategic pre-reading activities.

According to Timothy Shanahan, University of Illinois professor /reading researcher who also serves on the English Language Arts Work Team for the Common Core State Standards, "more strategic and more responsive pre-reads should be the hallmarks of common core reading lessons." Reflecting on the extensive classroom videos of reading lessons he observed as a National Title I Evaluator, Shanahan observed that the length of pre-reading lessons often exceeded the actual reading itself. "The blood is so sucked by these Dracula-like pre-reading sessions that the texts become lifeless. Why read if you already know everything that the text can possibly say?"

3. Increased use of text-dependent questioning that encourages students to reread in order to determine what the text says, what it means, and why it really matters.

Such rereading, we believe, is most likely to be accomplished when teachers ask meaningful questions that require students to read, question, reflect, and really *work on figuring out* what the text has to offer.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

For our first year with embracing the Common Core State Standards, there are two student outcomes we want to see:

1. As students experience the expected frustration with complex text and how teachers are approaching it differently, we ultimately want to see students having increased confidence because they come to realize that complex text is not supposed to be easy and that struggling with it is a good thing. We want them to know that they can do hard things. By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, we expect that at least 80% of our student body will express increased confidence in their ability to read complex text.
2. As their comfort with complex text increases, we do expect to see their ability to understand difficult text with greater independence and success, as measured by standardized tests such as FAIR and FCAT 2.0.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Identifying and having access to appropriate text. 2. Lack of professional development in close reading strategies. 3. Varying abilities of skill levels in the classroom.		
Strategy(s): 1. Utilize Appendix B from the CCSS 2. Consult in-house experts on unpacking the CCSS. 3. Receive professional development on scaffolding strategies for close reading.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** • New process for us (educators) • Still in "unpacking" stage • Buy-in from students regarding rereading **Strategy(s):** • Share samples of PARCC's assessment (in development) with students • Implement one to two close reading strategies with depth and consistency.	36% (223 students)	41% (254 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):**	n/a	n/a

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** • New process for us (educators) • Still in "unpacking" stage • Buy-in from students regarding rereading **Strategy(s):** • Share samples of PARCC's assessment (in development) with students • Implement one to two close reading strategies with depth and consistency.	37% (229 students)	42% (260 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Varied levels of fluency within the same Supported Class • Generalization of Reading Strategies **Strategy(s):** • Differentiate the text structure; reciprocal teaching strategies • Differentiate the text structure and vocabulary; reciprocal teaching strategies • Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization	100% (3 students)	100% (5 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Various levels of fluency within the same Supported Class • Generalization of Reading Strategies **Strategy(s):** • Differentiated text structure and vocabulary; reciprocal teaching strategies • Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted • Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization	100% (3 students)	100% (5 students)
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Difficulty students have with complex text **Strategy(s):** • Use of MESH Strategy handbook to scaffold close-reading lessons	60% (92 students)	65% (100 students)

<table>
<tr><td>Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading

Barrier(s):
• Various levels of fluency within the same Supported Class
• Generalization of Reading Strategies

Strategy(s):
• Differentiated text structure and vocabulary; reciprocal teaching strategies
• Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted
• Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:

Baseline data 2010-11:

<table><tr><th>% making satisfactory progress in reading</th><th></th></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>Black / African-American</td><td>29%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>63%</td></tr><tr><td>American Indian</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>61%</td></tr></table></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</td><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</td></tr>
<tr><td>White:</td><td>25% (114 students)</td><td>79% (400 students)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Black:</td><td>62% (18 students)</td><td>41% (11 students)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hispanic:</td><td>26% (20 students)</td><td>79% (29 students)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Asian:</td><td>27% (4 students)</td><td>59% (9 students)</td></tr>
<tr><td>American Indian:</td><td>N/A</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading
Barrier(s):
• Language sophistication of complex text (double-meaning words, idioms, text structure)

Strategy(s):
• Partner with mentor students.
• Directly teach the idioms &/or provide a basic explanation.
• Frequent formative assessment – What does it say? What does it mean?</td><td>n/a</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Difficulty with independent learning (e.g., homework, practice, etc.) • Organizational issues • Need for additional practice / support **Strategy(s):** • Use of Thinking Maps • Frequent formative assessment – What does it say? What does it mean? • Partner with mentor students. • Exit slips followed by clarifications the following day. • Extended Learning Opportunities Program (Remediation / Enrichment, as applicable) • Parent Workshop on available resources and how to access them	58% (81 students)	49% (56 students)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Inconsistent access to resources **Strategy(s):** • Parent Workshop on available resources and how to access them • Use of school's "caring closet" for school supplies, clothing, etc. • Extended Learning Opportunities Program	37% (83 students)	68% (146 students)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Understanding the Common Core State Standards	Ongoing through faculty meetings and Language Arts Department meetings	Language Arts teachers share the unpacking process in team meetings
Close Reading	By December, 2012: All teachers will have PD in first steps of text-dependent questioning	Modeling by reading coach, teacher leaders Internet links of modeled lessons for PLC's and departments to view / discuss
Understanding text complexity, including how to determine a text's level of complexity	By December, 2012: All teachers will have PD in how to use the rubric to determine "complex text" and how to locate resources for complex text	Monitoring – lesson plans with reflections using text from Appendix B or from Unpacking the Core Standards curriculum book (district document) Teams to take turns sharing complex text resources

Parent Workshop on the shift between FCAT 2.0 and Common Core	Parent Conference Nights: October 29, 2012 and February 25, 2012	In-house experts present quick strategy ideas &/or address concerns regarding CCSS at JPO meetings

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 50%	Lack of practice	• Frequent practice in listening / speaking in classes • Providing students a 'focus' for listening	Administration Guidance Services Professional
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 13%	Language sophistication of complex text (double-meaning words, idioms, text structure)	• Partner with mentor students. • Directly teach the idioms &/or provide a basic explanation. • Frequent formative assessment – What does it say? What does it mean?	Administration Guidance Services Professional
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 13%	Lack of practice	• Frequent practice in listening / speaking in classes • Providing students a 'focus' for listening	Administration Guidance Services Professional

Mathematics Goal(s): 1. **We plan to enhance student achievement by starting to implement the Standards of Mathematical Practice contained in the Common Core Stands, by enriching students' academic vocabulary as it relates to Mathematical content**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): • Lack of student technology literacy • Deficiency in basic vocabulary • Varying ability levels		

Strategy(s): • PD on CCSS • Teach students to use appropriate tools strategically • Have students contextualize and de-contextualize real life problems		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** • Lack of prior knowledge • No depth to student responses **Strategy(s):** • Use common Core Strategies to help make sense of word problems and persevere in solving the problems	32% (198 students)	38% (115 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** • Lack of Basic Number Sense • Difficulty remembering processes • Generalization of necessary steps to complete real-world problems **Strategy(s):** • Use of manipulatives, and visual supports for processes, and steps • Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted. • Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization	33% (1 student)	20% (1 student)
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** • Lack of prior knowledge • No depth to student responses **Strategy(s):** • Engage in PLC discussions about effective ways help students reason abstractly and quantitatively	41% (257 students)	46% (131 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** • Lack of Basic Number Sense • Difficulty remembering processes • Generalization of necessary steps to complete real-world problems **Strategy(s):** • Use of manipulatives, and visual supports for processes, and steps • Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted. • Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization	67% (2 students)	80% (4 students)

<table>
<tr>
<td>Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics
Barrier(s):
• Lack of Basic Number Sense
• Difficulty remembering processes
• Generalization of necessary steps to complete real world problems

Strategy(s):
• Use of manipulatives, and visual supports for processes and steps
• Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted
• Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization</td>
<td>100%
(3 students)</td>
<td>100%
(5 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCAT 2.0
Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics
Barrier(s):
• Lack of prior knowledge
• Lack of student “buy in”
• Lack of one on one tutoring

Strategy(s):
• ASP after/before school tutoring/extended learning opportunities
• Peer tutoring on Academic Lab Wednesdays</td>
<td>52%
(78 students)</td>
<td>60%
(93 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics
Barrier(s):
• Lack of Basic Number Sense
• Difficulty remembering processes
• Generalization of necessary steps to complete real-world problems

Strategy(s):
• Use of manipulatives, and visual supports for processes and steps
• Application of Smart Board that allows individualized skills to be targeted
• Student interaction integrating visual, kinesthetic, and melodic learning modalities to promote generalization</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:

Baseline Data 2010-11:
<table>
<tr><th>% making satisfactory progress in reading</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td>White</td><td>81%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Black / African-American</td><td>35%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>81%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Asian</td><td>81%</td></tr>
<tr><td>American Indian</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>44%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>67%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	23% (105 students)	84%
Black:	65% (19 students)	46%
Hispanic:	23% (18 students)	84%
Asian:	0% (15 students tested)	46%
American Indian:	n/a	n/a
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	n/a	n/a
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	52% (73 students)	53% (60 students)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	35% (79 students)	73% (156 students)

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Continued discussion on the eight Common Core State Standards for Mathematical Practice	Ongoing	Department meeting agendas and minutes Comment slips
Integrated Technology such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Gliffy and Khan Academy	January 2012	Exit slips Application of technology in the classroom

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): 1. Student writing from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 demonstrates a lack of support and logical reasoning. 2. We have a lack of school wide understanding of what acceptable writing is. **Strategy(s):** 1. Support-based writing assignments across the content areas 2. Create, disseminate and follow a "standard for acceptable writing" across the school (e.g., basic capitalization and punctuation; complete sentences, no text talk)		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	78% (235 students)	83% (249 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing **Barriers:** • Poor Communication Skills • Lack of Metalinguistic Skills **Strategies**: • Graphic Organizationers • Guided Writing, with application of Smart Board •	100% (1 student)	100% (1 student)

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1. We will improve student achievement by teaching students how to determine the meaning of unfamiliar word parts by knowing roots, prefixes, and suffixes so they can understand new words in complex science texts.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): • Uncertainty of which word parts to teach • Unsure of the strategies to use • Over-testing of students might skew pre-test / post-test results **Strategy(s):** • Research most common word parts for science • Refer to in-house experts for assistance and strategies • Teach the word parts using various best-practice strategies • Administer pre/post-tests when other major testing is not scheduled		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	47% (142 students)	52% (156 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	n/a	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	25% (75 students)	30% (90 students)

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	100% (1 student)	100% (1 student)

Science Goal(s) (High School) 1.	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	-----	-----
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	-----	-----
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	-----	-----
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:	-----	-----
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	-----	-----
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	-----	-----
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	-----	-----

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal We plan to enhance student achievement by starting to implement the Standards of Mathematical Practice contained in the Common Core Standards by enriching student's academic vocabulary as it relates to Mathematical content	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

Barrier(s): • Lack of student technology literacy • Deficiency in basic vocabulary • Varying ability levels. • Lack of prior knowledge • No depth to student responses • Pacing of material **Strategy(s):** • Professional Development • Teach students to use appropriate tools strategically • Have students contextualize and de-contextualize real life problems • Use Common Core Strategies to help make sense of word problems and preserve in solving the problems • Engage in PLC discussions about effective ways to help students reason abstractly and quantitatively.	100% (97 students)	100% (98 students)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	22% (21 students)	17% (17 students)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	78% (76 students)	80% (81 students)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 120 tested; 91% pass rate		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian**	 0% (70 students tested) 0% (1 student tested) 0% (15 students tested) 0% (3 students tested)	 100% (80 students) 100% (0 students) 100% (10 students) 100% (2 students)
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	n/a	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	n/a	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0% (14 students)	
Geometry EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**

Barrier(s): • Lack of student technology literacy • Deficiency in basic vocabulary • Varying ability levels. • Lack of prior knowledge • No depth to student responses • Pacing of material **Strategy(s):** • Professional Development • Teach students to use appropriate tools strategically • Have students contextualize and de-contextualize real life problems • Use Common Core Strategies to help make sense of word problems and preserve in solving the problems • Engage in PLC discussions about effective ways to help students reason abstractly and quantitatively		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**	n/a	80% (19 students)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	n/a	20% (5 students)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 n/a		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:**	n/a	23 students 0 students 0 students 1 student
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	n/a	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	n/a	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	n/a	

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:	-----	-----
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	-----	-----

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:	n/a	70% (225 students)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:	n/a	20% (64 students)

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:**	-----	-----
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:	-----	-----

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**	-----	-----	-----

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**	-----	-----	-----

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2**:	-----	-----	-----

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS) Guidance Counselors, School Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist, Academic teachers and the Assistant Principal. This MTSS Leadership team is expected to assist in the development and implementation plan.

We train the faculty annually on the MTSS process. Topics covered include Brevard County's MTSS manual, tier system, school-wide intervention model and technology available to assist in documentation of teacher efforts.

The district provides A3 software (including PMP, Vision, and RTI sections) to be used to manage data collection and analysis, progress monitoring and intervention/assessment management. Baseline data: Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT); Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) Progress Monitoring: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation.

Midyear: Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

End of the Year: FAIR, FCAT 2.0

Frequency Data Days: Twice a month for data analysis

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Jefferson has a very active parent organization. The name of the organization is the Jefferson Parent Organization (JPO). Jefferson's JPO participates in numerous school activities throughout the year. Our JPO also provides funding for many of our student activities. In addition, JPO members volunteer approximately 10,000 hours each year at Jefferson. As a result of the amount of time our parents volunteer, Jefferson has earned the Five Star School award annually. The JPO also sponsors mini-grants for our faculty and staff in the amount of $500.00 increments. The administration meets with the JPO on a regular basis. We communicate with our parents through quarterly newsletters, Synervoice calls, email distribution lists and Edline. All teachers are required to use Edline to communicate with parents and keep them informed about student progress. Jefferson involves parents as stakeholders in the school improvement process as members of our School Advisory Council.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)
Jefferson Middle School's average attendance rate for the 2011-12 school year was 95.305. Our goal is to improve our attendance rate for the 2012-13 school year by sending home attendance letters for each student when they reach their fifth unexcused absence from school. Jefferson will also continue to run weekly attendance reports to monitor teachers taking attendance to check for accuracy. This year, we are implementing phone calls homes if the students are tardy to class.

If a student is late to school or late to class, a call is generated to their parents to notify the parents that their child was tardy. When students receive their fourth tardy to school per nine weeks, they will receive a discipline referral and a dean's detention in an effort to curtail this behavior.

SUSPENSION:
As a result of state and district budget cuts, we are unable to offer Saturday school or in school suspension on our discipline ladder. Therefore, our discipline ladder consists of three steps: detention, suspension pending parent conference and out of school suspension. Whenever possible, students are given a lesser consequence on the ladder. If an infraction of a serious nature occurs, a suspension pending parent conference will be issued an in effort to prevent a student from missing school. In the 2011-12 school years we had a total of 1098 incidents with 453 of those incidents resulting in suspensions.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):
N/A

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)
Jefferson Middle School has several academic levels to provide our students with the most appropriate placement to meet their academic needs. Jefferson students are able to apply for our Galileo program which is geared towards our higher level students. This program provides the students with rigorous and relevant subject area material. The program also requires that student apply to become a part of Galileo.

In addition to the Galileo program, Jefferson offers ESE, regular and advanced courses to our students. Our students are encouraged to participate in the most challenging courses as they relate to their previous years tests scores and their ability to put forth the greatest effort without making them feel discouraged. Our goal is to help every student become successful.

Our counselors meet with every student at Jefferson in an effort to assist the students with their postsecondary goals and opportunities. In addition, we offer several Career and Technical Education courses to our students. These courses are Family and Consumer Science, Technology and Business courses. These courses provide the students the opportunity to take a look at various career areas. Our core teachers prepare our students for postsecondary readiness by providing them with structured academic preparation. Beginning with the 2012-13 school year, having students ready for postsecondary success includes the implantation of the Common Core State Standards, which is the focus of our school improvement plan.