

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

**Name of School:**

JAMES MADISON MIDDLE SCHOOL

**Area:**

NORTH BREVARD

**Principal:**

SHERRY TOMLINSON

**Area Superintendent:**

DR. RONALD BOBAY

**SAC Chairperson:**

LORRAINE DEBAUN

**Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**

**Mission Statement:**

James Madison Middle School's mission is to meet the educational needs of each student.

**Vision Statement:**

James Madison Middle School's vision is a safe, relevant learning community that promotes academic excellence through high expectations, mutual respect, and positive role models.

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

## RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

For the first time since 2005, James Madison Middle School did not earn an “A” under the Florida Grading System. Cut scores were raised in the state of Florida, causing decline across all districts in the state. The number of points earned by Madison in 2012 would equate to a grade of “C”, however legislators anticipated the decline and mandated that schools could only drop one letter grade maximum from 2011 to 2012.

**READING:** Utilizing ALL student data (rather than “A+ data”), the percent of seventh grade students scoring at grade level (Level 3) or above (Levels 4, 5) on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading declined 4% (69% to 65%). Brevard declined 9% (78% to 69%) and Florida declined 10% (68% to 58%). Eighth grade students showed a greater decline (60% to 53%) with Brevard only declining 1% (65% to 64%) and Florida remaining the same at 55%. Specifically there was a 4% decline (75% to 71%) in the percent of Vocabulary questions answered correctly, and a 5% decline (69% to 64%) in Literacy Analysis at the eighth grade level. Eighth grade students did perform better in Reading Application (69% to 73%). Seventh grade students declined in Informational Text/Research Process. When reviewing school regression data, Madison’s students have historically performed just below expectation in reading. Madison’s students identified as black, as well as students identified as exceptional education (ESE) have the lowest percentage of students performing on grade level or above in 2012 (39% and 31%). Eighth grade ESE students performed the lowest overall. However, Madison’s black students showed the greatest learning gains of any subgroups tracked. Madison Middle School had 58% of its students scoring at or above grade level in 2012 (from 64%) according to FCAT Reading 2.0. Further data is disaggregated on the below charts for Reading:

Grade and Subject	Madison		Brevard		Florida	
	Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent
Seventh Grade Reading 2010	324	73%	337	79%	322	68%
Seventh Grade Reading 2011	320	69%	335	78%	322	68%
Seventh Grade Reading 2012	233	65%	237	69%	231	58%
Eighth Grade Reading 2010	315	59%	324	66%	312	55%
Eighth Grade Reading 2011	317	60%	324	65%	313	55%
Eighth Grade Reading 2012	238	53%	242	64%	237	55%

<b>READING 2012 TOTAL</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	225	14%	20%	36%	22%	7%	66%	68%	57%
8th	221	10%	38%	28%	17%	8%	54%	55%	62%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>READING 2012 WHITE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	167	12%	19%	40%	22%	7%	69%	61%	53%
8th	178	7%	37%	30%	18%	9%	56%	53%	61%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>READING 2012 BLACK</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	30	23%	37%	20%	13%	7%	40%	64%	59%
8th	23	22%	43%	26%	4%	4%	34%	61%	78%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>READING 2012 ED</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	122	20%	23%	30%	21%	6%	57%	40%	56%
8th	90	12%	44%	27%	12%	4%	43%	77%	54%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>READING 2012 ESE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	24	46%	25%	29%	0%	0%	29%	65%	56%
8th	22	41%	50%	9%	0%	0%	9%	38%	55%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>READING 2012 GIFTED</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	9	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	100%	56%	N/A
8th	15	0%	0%	15%	46%	39%	100%	69%	N/A
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>READING 2012 FEMALE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>% Learning Gain</b>	<b>Lowest 25% % Learning Gains</b>
7th	109	14%	17%	37%	24%	9%	70%	53%	58%
8th	112	8%	33%	32%	20%	7%	59%	55%	58%
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>58%</b>

READING 2012 MALE	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	116	15%	24%	36%	21%	4%	61%	39%	65%
8th	109	11%	42%	23%	15%	9%	47%	55%	56%
SCHOOL	225	12%	33%	31%	17%	7%	56%	47%	60%

### Reading

Total	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above	Learning Gains	Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2010	541	34%	23%	66%	55%	51%
2011	513	36%	25%	64%	56%	52%
2012	446	41%	27%	60%	62%	59%

White	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	421	32%	26%	68%
2011	385	32%	27%	68%
2012	345	38%	28%	63%
Black	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	79	52%	5%	48%
2011	66	54%	6%	45%
2012	53	62%	15%	39%
Female	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	275	29%	28%	71%
2011	270	34%	28%	66%
2012	221	36%	30%	64%
Male	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	264	39%	20%	61%
2011	243	38%	22%	61%
2012	225	45%	24%	56%
ED	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	227	39%	20%	61%
2011	244	44%	18%	60%

2012	212	49%	22%	52%
<b>ESE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	91	68%	4%	31%
2011	73	70%	6%	31%
2012	46	81%	0%	31%

READING	7th Grade		8th Grade	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
VOCABULARY	75%	78%	75%	71%
READING APPLICATION	71%	73%	69%	73%
LITERARY ANALYSIS	73%	80%	69%	64%
INFORMATIONAL TEXT / RESEARCH PROCESS	67%	64%	75%	75%

**MATH:** Utilizing ALL student data (rather than “A+ data”), the percent of seventh grade students scoring at grade level (Level 3) or above (Levels 4, 5) on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math declined 2% (62% to 60%). Brevard declined 5% (71% to 66%) and Florida declined 6% (62% to 56%). Eighth grade students showed a great decline (74% to 52%) with Brevard and Florida declining 11% (76% to 65% for Brevard and 68% to 57% for Florida). Specifically there was a 6% decline (53% to 47%) in the percent of Geometry/Measurement questions answered correctly. This decline in Geometry/Measurement was also noted at the seventh grade level (56% to 54%) showing a common need school wide. Eighth grade students did perform better in Expressions/Equations/Functions (53% to 58%). In addition, seventh grade students declined in Number/Base Ten (64% to 55%) while performing better in Ratios/Proportional Relationships (50% to 58%). When reviewing school regression data, Madison’s students have historically performed right above expectation in math. On the 2012 Seventh Grade Math FCAT 2.0, Madison ranked 411 of the 1091 middle schools in the state with a mean DSS of 235. Madison ranked 318 in regards to the percentage of students at or above Level 3. On the 2012 Eighth Grade Math FCAT 2.0, Madison ranked 455 of the 1091 middle schools in the state with a mean DSS of 241. Madison ranked 476 in regards to the percentage of students at or above Level 3. In Brevard, however, Madison’s eighth grade Math ranking by mean DSS was 16 out of 16. As seen on FCAT Reading, Madison’s students identified as black, as well as students identified as exceptional education (ESE) have the lowest percentage of students performing on grade level or above on FCAT Math 2.0 2012 (48% and 33%). In addition, those students identified as Economically Disadvantaged joined these identified lowest performing subgroups with 50% performing at or above grade level. Seventh grade ESE students performed the lowest overall. However, Madison’s ESE students showed the greatest learning gains overall of any subgroups tracked. Madison Middle School had 56% of its students scoring at or above grade level in 2012 (from 68%) according to FCAT Math 2.0. Further data is disaggregated on the below charts for Math:

Grade and Subject	Madison		Brevard		Florida	
Seventh Grade Math 2010	315	66%	327	73%	314	61%
Seventh Grade Math 2011	313	62%	326	71%	314	62%
Seventh Grade Math 2012	235	60%	240	66%	236	56%
Eighth Grade Math 2010	330	78%	335	79%	324	68%
Eighth Grade Math 2011	325	74%	333	76%	325	68%
Eighth Grade Math 2012	241	52%	247	65%	243	57%

MATH 2012 TOTAL	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	223	16%	24%	40%	15%	5%	62%	39%	35%
8th	219	19%	29%	34%	13%	4%	55%	53%	47%
SCHOOL	442	18%	27%	37%	14%	5%	59%	42%	45%

MATH 2012 WHITE	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	165	14%	23%	41%	16%	5%	62%	42%	33%
8th	176	17%	30%	35%	13%	5%	53%	44%	48%
SCHOOL	341	16%	27%	38%	14%	5%	61%	43%	40%

MATH 2012 BLACK	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	30	30%	23%	37%	10%	0%	47%	29%	36%
8th	23	26%	30%	39%	4%	0%	43%	60%	70%
SCHOOL	53	28%	26%	38%	7%	0%	48%	43%	52%

MATH 2012 ED	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	120	21%	27%	36%	14%	3%	53%	38%	37%
8th	89	24%	35%	30%	10%	1%	41%	52%	42%
SCHOOL	209	22%	30%	33%	12%	2%	50%	41%	40%

MATH 2012 ESE	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	23	52%	30%	17%	0%	0%	17%	53%	57%
8th	22	45%	27%	23%	5%	0%	27%	53%	60%
SCHOOL	45	50%	32%	16%	2%	0%	33%	53%	58%

MATH 2012 GIFTED	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	9	0%	0%	33%	44%	22%	100%	33%	N/A
8th	15	0%	7%	33%	40%	20%	93%	67%	N/A
SCHOOL	24	0%	4%	33%	42%	21%	96%	54%	N/A

MATH 2012 FEMALE	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	108	18%	22%	43%	14%	4%	61%	38%	21%
8th	111	18%	29%	38%	13%	3%	54%	49%	52%
SCHOOL	216	18%	26%	41%	14%	4%	59%	43%	38%

MATH 2012 MALE	# of Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 3 and above	% Learning Gain	Low 25% % Learning Gains
7th	115	15%	25%	37%	17%	6%	60%	41%	50%
8th	108	19%	31%	32%	12%	6%	50%	45%	55%
SCHOOL	227	17%	27%	34%	14%	6%	59%	43%	52%

### Math

Total	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above	Learning Gains	Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2010	541	28%	26%	78%	67%	65%
2011	512	32%	25%	68%	68%	66%
2012	442	44%	19%	59%	45%	48%

White	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	422	25%	28%	75%
2011	381	29%	29%	71%
2012	341	42%	20%	61%
Black	# of Students	Level 1, 2	Level 4, 5	Level 3 and above
2010	79	54%	12%	46%
2011	66	50%	8%	52%
2012	53	54%	7%	48%

<b>Female</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	275	28%	24%	72%
2011	270	34%	24%	66%
2012	216	44%	18%	59%
<b>Male</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	265	30%	27%	70%
2011	242	30%	29%	71%
2012	227	44%	20%	59%
<b>ED</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	227	40%	19%	60%
2011	243	40%	19%	60%
2012	209	53%	14%	50%
<b>ESE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	91	59%	8%	41%
2011	73	66%	3%	34%
2012	45	82%	2%	33%

<b>MATH</b>	<b>7th Grade</b>	
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
NUMBER / BASE TEN	64%	55%
RATIOS / PROPORTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	50%	58%
GEOMETRY AND MEASUREMENT	56%	54%
STATISTICS AND PROBABILITY	63%	63%
<b>MATH</b>	<b>8th Grade</b>	
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
NUMBER, OPERATIONS, PROBLEMS AND STATISTICS	58%	58%
EXPRESSIONS, EQUATIONS AND FUNCTIONS	53%	58%
GEOMETRY AND MEASUREMENT	53%	47%



**2012 GRADE 7 FCAT MATH IN ALPHA ORDER**

MATH GRADE 7				2011			2012			2011-2012 Change		
Rank in State MDSS (of 1,091)	Rank in State % Lev 3+ (of 1,091)	School Number	SCHOOL NAME	Mean Scale Score (SSS)	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above	Mean (DSS) 2.0	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above		Change in % Lev 1	Change % Levels 3 and Above
			<b>STATE</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>-78</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>BREVARD</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>-89</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-2</b>
411	318	0052	JAMES MADISON	313	21	62	235	16	60	-78	-5	-2
191	204	0141	ANDREW JACKSON	322	15	65	241	12	68	-81	-3	3
321	318	0302	SPACE COAST JR/SR	317	11	68	237	12	60	-80	1	-8
411	449	1031	CLEARLAKE MIDDLE	315	15	64	235	15	53	-80	0	-11
250	304	1081	RON MCNAIR MIDDLE	322	14	75	239	15	61	-83	1	-14
141	158	1101	JOHN F KENNEDY	338	7	81	243	11	71	-95	4	-10
485	449	2071	STONE MIDDLE	321	18	65	233	25	53	-88	7	-12
321	270	2122	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE	314	17	61	237	17	63	-77	0	2
367	345	3021	CENTRAL JUNIOR	314	18	64	236	16	59	-78	-2	-5
367	363	3031	LYNDON B JOHN	323	11	69	236	18	58	-87	7	-11
4	4	3141	WEST SHORE JR/SR	369	0	98	259	0	99	-	0	1
6	4	4021	EDGEWOOD JR/SR	363	0	98	258	1	99	-	0	1
141	150	4111	THOMAS JEFFERSON	338	6	83	243	10	72	-95	4	-11
68	91	5011	COCOA BEACH JR/SR	350	6	84	247	7	77	-	0	0
68	71	6012	DELAURA MIDDLE	345	5	86	247	5	80	-98	0	-6
55	46	6082	HERBERT HOOVER	344	5	82	248	6	84	-96	1	2

**2012 GRADE 8 FCAT MATH IN ALPHA ORDER**

MATH GRADE 8				2011			2012			2011-2012 Change		
Rank in State MDSS (of 1,100)	Rank in State % Lev 3+ (of 1,100)	School Number	SCHOOL NAME	Mean Scale Score (SSS)	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above	Mean (DSS) 2.0	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above		Change in % Lev 1	Change % Levels 3 and Above
			<b>STATE</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-82</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-11</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>BREVARD</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>-91</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-12</b>
455	476	0052	JAMES MADISON	325	8	74	241	19	52	-84	11	-22
291	250	0141	ANDREW JACKSON	325	10	70	245	18	65	-80	8	-5

322	316	0302	SPACE COAST JR/SR	319	9	65	244	11	61	-75	2	-4
407	405	1031	CLEARLAKE MIDDLE	321	10	68	242	20	55	-79	10	-13
322	333	1081	RON MCNAIR MIDDLE	333	8	74	244	19	60	-89	11	-14
145	152	1101	JOHN F KENNEDY	339	4	82	250	8	73	-89	4	-9
407	462	2071	STONE MIDDLE	328	10	72	242	26	53	-86	16	-19
322	316	2122	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE	332	7	79	244	20	61	-88	13	-18
291	316	3021	CENTRAL JUNIOR	326	9	72	245	15	61	-81	6	-11
363	405	3031	LYNDON B JOHNSON	331	8	74	243	20	55	-88	12	-19
12	6	3141	WEST SHORE JR/SR	370	0	99	262	1	96	-108	1	-3
8	9	4021	EDGEWOOD JR/SR	368	1	98	263	0	94	-105	-1	-4
123	120	4111	THOMAS JEFFERSON	343	4	85	251	9	76	-92	5	-9
84	152	5011	COCOA BEACH JR/SR	346	4	84	253	11	73	-93	7	-11
123	98	6012	DELAURA MIDDLE	341	5	85	251	8	78	-90	3	-7
84	89	6082	HERBERT HOOVER	332	6	77	253	5	79	-79	-1	2

**WRITING:** Utilizing ALL student data (rather than “A+ data”), the percent of students scoring at Level 3 or above on 2012 FCAT 2.0 FCAT Writes declined 3% (83% to 80%). This was a trend noted across the State due to the difference in how the test was being scored. Brevard and Florida declined 4% (82% to 78%). When reviewing school regression data, Madison’s students have historically performed just below expectation in writing. Of note is that none of Madison’s students scored at Level 6 and fewer than 10% scored above Level 4. Of note also is that there were no students identified as Gifted who scored above grade level in Writing. On the 2012 FCAT Writes, Madison ranked 7 out of 16 middle schools in Brevard. Madison’s students identified as black, economically disadvantaged, as well as students identified as exceptional education (ESE) once again (just like Reading and Math) had the lowest percentage of students performing on grade level or above in 2012 (77%, 77% and 52%). Further data is disaggregated on the below charts for Writing:

Grade and Subject	Madison		Brevard		Florida	
	Grade	Percent	Grade	Percent	Grade	Percent
Eighth Grade Writing 2010	4.0	73%	4.1	97%	4.1	96%
Eighth Grade Writing 2011	4.2	83%	4.2	82%	4.2	82%
Eighth Grade Writing 2012	3.3	80%	3.3	78%	3.3	78%

<b>WRITING 2012 TOTAL</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	219	2%	1%	7%	10%	28%	19%	24%	7%	2%	<.5	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 WHITE</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	173	1%	1%	7%	10%	27%	18%	23%	8%	2%	1%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 BLACK</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	25	<.5	0%	0%	19%	23%	19%	31%	4%	0%	0%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 ED</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	92	2%	1%	9%	12%	34%	18%	18%	4%	0%	1%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 ESE</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	21	20%	0%	20%	15%	20%	20%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 GIFTED</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	15	0%	0%	1%	0%	13%	20%	53%	7%	0%	0%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 FEMALE</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	111	0%	0%	2%	7%	27%	23%	28%	10%	3%	0%	0%
<b>WRITING 2012 MALE</b>	<b># of Student s</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 1.5</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 2.5</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 3.5</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 4.5</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 5.5</b>	<b>Level 6</b>
	108	4%	2%	12%	14%	28%	15%	20%	5%	1%	1%	0%

## Writing

<b>Total</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	255	<.5	4%	98%	88%	73%
2011	262	<.5	5%	88%		83%
2012	219	2%	0%	80%	53%	34%
<b>White</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	199	<.5	3%	97%		75%
2011	163	<.5	5%	99%		82%
2012	173	1%	0%	80%	52%	34%
<b>Black</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	37	<.5	5%	100%		62%
2011	33	<.5	<.5	100%		85%
2012	25	4%	0%	77%	54%	35%
<b>Female</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	131	<.5	5%	98%		86%
2011	139	<.5	5%	100%		90%
2012	111	0%	0%	91%	64%	41%
<b>Male</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	124	<.5	2%	97%		60%
2011	123	<.5	4%	98%		76%
2012	108	44%	0%	69%	41%	26%
<b>ED</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	91	<.5	3%	95%		65%
2011	121	<.5	3%	100%		79%
2012	92	2%	0%	77%	42%	24%
<b>ESE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 6</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>	<b>Level 3.5 and above</b>	<b>Level 4 and above</b>
2010	40	<.5	<0.5%	90%		58%
2011	33	<.5	3%	97%		58%
2012	21	19%	0%	52%	24%	5%

**2012 Grade 8 FCAT WRITING RESULTS**

**Alphabetical**

School Number	School Name				Mean Essay Score	Mean Essay Score	Mean Essay Score	% at 3.5	% at 4.0
		% at Proficiency 4.0 +	% at Proficiency 3.0 +	11-12 incr/decr % at proficiency					
		2011	2012		2011	2012		2012	2012
<b>State</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Brevard</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>0141</b>	ANDREW JACKSON	77	74	-3	4.0	3.2	-0.8	43	26
<b>3021</b>	CENTRAL	80	76	-4	4.1	3.2	-0.9	45	26
<b>1031</b>	CLEARLAKE	79	77	-2	4.0	3.2	-0.8	42	24
<b>5011</b>	COCOA BEACH	92	86	-6	4.4	3.7	-0.7	71	54
<b>6012</b>	DELAURA	88	87	-1	4.4	3.5	-0.9	68	47
<b>4021</b>	EDGEWOOD	92	94	2	4.6	3.6	-1.0	71	44
<b>6082</b>	HERBERT HOOVER	78	84	6	4.1	3.3	-0.8	51	30
<b>0052</b>	JAMES MADISON	83	80	-3	4.2	3.3	-0.9	53	34
<b>1101</b>	JOHN KENNEDY	89	87	-2	4.4	3.5	-0.9	63	41
<b>3031</b>	LYNDON JOHNSON	82	67	-15	4.1	3	-1.1	38	21
<b>1081</b>	RONALD MCNAIR	82	83	1	4.3	3.4	-0.9	58	39
<b>2122</b>	SOUTHWEST	74	66	-8	4.0	3	-1.0	36	21
<b>0302</b>	SPACE COAST	81	75	-6	4.4	3.3	-1.1	49	31
<b>2071</b>	STONE	80	78	-2	4.1	3.2	-0.9	52	31
<b>4111</b>	THOMAS JEFFERSON	89	78	-11	4.4	3.3	-1.1	53	34
<b>3141</b>	WEST SHORE JR	96	98	2	4.8	4	-0.8	88	71

**SCIENCE:** Utilizing ALL student data (rather than “A+ data”), the percent of students scoring at grade level (Level 3) or above (Levels 4, 5) on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science declined 2% (50% to 48%). Brevard declined 1% (60% to 59%) and Florida remained the same (46%). Specifically there was a 14% decline (69% to 55%) in the percent of Nature of Science questions answered correctly, and a 4% decline (64% to 60%) in Earth/Space Science and Physical Science. Life Science improved (62% to 67%) in 2012. Madison did score higher than the state average in science, but lower than the district average. On the 2012 Science FCAT 2.0, Madison ranked 343 of the 1091 middle schools in the state with a mean DSS of 320. In Brevard, Madison’s Science ranking by mean DSS was 12 out of 16. When reviewing school regression data, Madison’s students have historically performed just below expectation in science. Madison’s students identified as black, as well as students identified as exceptional education (ESE) once again (just like Reading and Math) have the lowest percentage of students performing on grade level or above in 2012 (33% and 28%). Further data is disaggregated on the below charts for Science:

<b>Grade and Subject</b>	<b>Madison</b>		<b>Brevard</b>		<b>Florida</b>		
<b>Eighth Grade Science 2010</b>	321	48%		333	58%	310	43%
<b>Eighth Grade Science 2011</b>	323	50%		338	60%	315	46%
<b>Eighth Grade Science 2012</b>	320	48%		335	59%	316	46%

<b>SCIENCE 2012 TOTAL</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
<b>SCHOOL</b>	219	16%	36%	41%	4%	3%	49%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 WHITE</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	174	14%	36%	42%	4%	3%	51%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 BLACK</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	25	28%	36%	36%	0%	0%	33%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 ED</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	93	22%	39%	38%	2%	0%	40%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 ESE</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	21	48%	38%	14%	0%	0%	28%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 GIFTED</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	15	0%	0%	67%	27%	7%	100%
<b>SCIENCE 2012 FEMALE</b>							
<b>SCHOOL</b>	111	21%	40%	35%	4%	1%	41%

<b>SCIENCE 2012 MALE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
<b>SCHOOL</b>	109	12%	32%	47%	5%	5%	57%

<b>Science</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	254	52%	8%	48%
2011	265	50%	11%	50%
2012	220	52%	7%	48%
<b>White</b>				
<b>White</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	198	49%	10%	51%
2011	195	41%	18%	59%
2012	173	51%	8%	49%
<b>Black</b>				
<b>Black</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	36	72%	0%	28%
2011	34	77%	4%	23%
2012	25	64%	0%	33%
<b>Female</b>				
<b>Female</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	128	59%	5%	41%
2011	140	57%	11%	43%
2012	111	60%	5%	40%
<b>Male</b>				
<b>Male</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	125	55%	12%	55%
2011	125	52%	14%	48%
2012	109	44%	9%	56%
<b>ED</b>				
<b>ED</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	88	64%	6%	36%
2011	122	67%	6%	33%
2012	93	60%	2%	40%
<b>ESE</b>				
<b>ESE</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Level 1, 2</b>	<b>Level 4, 5</b>	<b>Level 3 and above</b>
2010	40	78%	3%	23%
2011	32	82%	3%	18%
2012	21	86%	0%	28%

SCIENCE	8th Grade	
	2011	2012
NATURE OF SCIENCE	69%	55%
EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE	64%	60%
PHYSICAL SCIENCE	64%	60%
LIFE SCIENCE	62%	67%

2012 GRADE 8 FCAT SCIENCE IN ALPHA ORDER												
SCIENCE GRADE 8				2011			2012			2011-2012 Change		
Rank in State MDSS (of 1094)	Rank in State % Lev 3+ (of 1094)	School Number	SCHOOL NAME	Mean Scale Score (SSS)	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above	Mean (DSS) 2.0	% Lev 1	% Levels 3 and Above		Change in % Lev 1	Change % Levels 3 and Above
			<b>STATE</b>	315	23	46	316	22	46	1	-1	0
<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>BREVARD</b>	338	12	60	335	13	59	-3	1	-1
343	343	0052	JAMES MADISON	323	14	50	320	16	48	-3	2	-2
175	213	0141	ANDREW JACKSON	328	14	53	335	13	57	7	-1	4
254	227	0302	SPACE COAST JR/SR	332	9	56	328	9	56	-4	0	0
343	370	1031	CLEARLAKE MIDDLE	314	20	44	320	16	47	6	-4	3
145	133	1081	RON MCNAIR MIDDLE	346	8	64	339	10	63	-7	2	-1
166	185	1101	JOHN F KENNEDY	339	11	65	336	12	59	-3	1	-6
392	412	2071	STONE MIDDLE	326	19	52	317	20	45	-9	1	-7
392	394	2122	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE	332	13	56	317	20	46	-15	7	-10
306	302	3021	CENTRAL JUNIOR	327	14	53	323	15	51	-4	1	-2
356	343	3031	LYNDON B JOHNSON	330	13	55	319	17	48	-11	4	-7
6	6	3141	WEST SHORE JR/SR	392	0	98	387	0	91	-5	0	-7
15	9	4021	EDGEWOOD JR/SR	387	0	93	372	0	88	-15	0	-5
54	54	4111	THOMAS JEFFERSON	347	8	68	352	7	72	5	-1	4
14	24	5011	COCOA BEACH JR/SR	364	6	75	373	6	80	9	0	5
29	30	6012	DELAURA MIDDL	361	6	75	363	4	77	2	-2	2
62	35	6082	HERBERT HOOVER	337	12	57	351	7	76	14	-5	19

below state average

decrease from previous year



Overall, the data illustrates that a decline in students scoring at or above grade level on FCAT 2.0 2012 was realized across the state and the district at the Middle School level.

In reading and math, Madison’s 7<sup>th</sup> grade students did not decline in performance at the same pace as those in Brevard and Florida. Madison’s 8<sup>th</sup> grade students declined greater than those in Brevard and Florida.

In science, Madison’s students declined just slightly greater than the district and state. In writing, Madison’s students did not decline as much as the district and state.

READING					
Madison 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Florida 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Brevard 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Madison 8th Grade Compared to 2011	Florida 8th Grade Compared to 2011	Brevard 8th Grade Compared to 2011
-4%	-10%	-9%	-7%	-1%	0%
Math					
Madison 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Florida 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Brevard 7th Grade Compared to 2011	Madison 8th Grade Compared to 2011	Florida 8th Grade Compared to 2011	Brevard 8th Grade Compared to 2011
-2%	-6%	-5%	-22%	-11%	-11%
Writing			Science		
Madison Compared to 2011	Florida Compared to 2011	Brevard Compared to 2011	Madison Compared to 2011	Florida Compared to 2011	Brevard Compared to 2011
-3%	-4%	-4%	-2%	0%	-1%

James Madison Middle School Regression Data (Standard Deviation from the Mean)						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading Proficiency	-0.87	-0.08	-0.54	0.25	0.33	
Mathematics Proficiency	0.73	0.83	0.38	0.34	0.15	
Science Proficiency	0.23	0.28	0.96	0.56	0.39	
Writing Proficiency	not avail	not avail	not avail	3.07	0.04	
Total Points	not avail	not avail	below	1.12	0.95	

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

“Since the early 1960s, middle-level schools have been consistently and continually working to improve the ways that the pre- and early adolescent child is taught. Middle schools were among the first schools in the country to use flexible block schedules, giving more time and more flexibility to teachers and teams.” [Best Practices from America’s Middle Schools, 1999]. James Madison Middle School is the only middle school in Brevard County currently utilizing the block schedule. Students from Madison continue into Astronaut High School which also utilizes the block schedule. Neither school has participated in block scheduling professional development for many years, and thus it can be assumed that there are teachers on campus who have never experienced this type of training and others who may not be applying some of the knowledge gained with consistency.

As is typical in most secondary classrooms, teachers traditionally have utilized a lecture format, followed by practice time as this seemed to be the most efficient manner to provide exposure to content when teachers are faced with a 40 to 45 minute class period. As is known through our B.E.S.T. training, the lecture followed by practice time is probably not the most effective way to engage students and allow for their mastery of the content.

To gain an understanding from the student population at Madison as to what they feel helps them learn best, students were surveyed while in their homeroom class on September 20, 2012 (approximately 6 weeks into the school year). The responses were varied but in commonality was engagement, as is seen in the following noted responses:

Hands-on activities, group work, small group, partner work, projects, one-on-one with the teacher, visuals (movies, PowerPoints, Video Clips), teacher demonstrations/presentations/modeling, working on the computer, examples/explanations, diagrams/drawings/games, white boards, being able to move around, fun activities, calm room.

When asked what interferes with their learning in the classroom, the following responses were noted: students talking/playing/joking/screaming/throwing things/off task/rude/bad/bullying/tapping/misbehaving, really big words, dim lights, mean teachers, hunger, presenting by myself, writing definitions, stuff with lots of instructions, teacher lectures, getting an assignment and then the teacher just goes on, pretty girls.

Further information was gleaned from the 2011-2012 BPS Student Survey. Students indicated that they are most interested in learning when they “choose the way they do an assignment”.

A review of the BPS 2011-2012 Parent Survey shows that nearly 57% of the 176 Madison parents who responded rated their satisfaction with classroom instruction as “Good”, while 27% rated it as “Excellent”. This was a most positive response. In regards to specific curricular subjects, the results were again highly favorable:

Reading/LA 48% Good; 39% Excellent  
Mathematics 40% Good; 31% Excellent  
Science 50% Good; 37% Excellent  
Social Studies 53% Good; 39% Excellent  
Electives 51% Good; 32% Excellent

In addition, parents rated how satisfied they were with the overall quality of Madison. 49% rated Madison “Good” and 40% rated us “Excellent”.

On August 24, 2012, thirty-one faculty members completed a 22 question survey relative to their understanding and use of various teaching/learning strategies. Teachers responded to each strategy utilizing a Likert scale of 1-4:

- 4 = I **understand** and already **fully implement** this strategy in **each of my classes**.
- 3 = I **understand** and **use** this strategy, but I **need to practice using it more** in my classroom.
- 2 = I **can explain** this strategy, but I **am not currently using it often** or **at all** in my classroom.
- 1 = I **do not understand** this strategy, and I **do not currently use** it in my classroom.

In response to use of “small group instruction, 5 teachers reported an answer of “2”, with 13 more reporting an answer of “3”. Thirteen teachers reported full understanding and use of small group instruction in each of their classes. In response to “student interest surveys”, 2 teachers reported an answer of “1”, 11 reported an answer of “2”, 7 reported an answer of “3”, and 4 reported understanding and using interest surveys in each of their classes. In response to “learning profile surveys”, 11 teachers reported an answer of “1”, 11 reported an answer of “2”, 5 reported an answer of “3”, and 4 reported understanding and using interest surveys in each of their classes.

For student options on assignments, homework, and assessment, the following responses were noted:

	Assignment Options:	Homework Options:	Assessment Options
# responses of “1”	2	4	3
# responses of “2”	16	15	19
# responses of “3”	9	7	6
# responses of “4”	4	1	3

In response to product assignments and assessments: In response to utilizing visual organizers like Thinking Maps:

# responses of “1”	16	2
# responses of “2”	4	3
# responses of “3”	7	11
# responses of “4”	4	15

Other strategies on the survey were: “hook” prior to start of unit/lesson, engaging students in debate, individual student goal setting, student led conferences, providing justification and student friendly objective prior to start of lesson, furniture arrangement and time allocated for student collaboration, grading with rubrics, pre-assessment followed by changing lesson plan based upon result, response solicitation other than hands raised (clickers, white boards, fist to five, pair/share, jigsaw), curriculum compacting, standards-based grading, higher order questioning, word wall and use of vocabulary in context, and non-verbal representations (graphs, charts, maps).

Thus, while the Madison community is pleased with the instruction happening at Madison, the data reveals that we must continue to face the challenge of utilizing the block schedule to our best advantage and rise to the high rigor that is facing us with implementation of Common Core Standards. These surveys reinforced to us that some of our faculty could benefit from staff development relative to varied teaching/learning strategies to help engage students in a block schedule, as well as utilization of differentiated instruction. It also reinforced that some of our faculty could benefit from support to implement teaching/learning strategies with fidelity as many have an understanding of the strategies but are not successfully utilizing them consistently.

Madison is one of four schools to receive a Literacy and Writing Design Collaborative grant to integrate higher level Common Core Standards across the curriculum. Teachers involved in this grant are creating modules based on the Literacy Design Collaborative that support CORE content teachers in implementing common core standards. A standard format provides clarity and support for teachers as well as the flexibility to be creative. Each module focuses on a specific teaching task and includes: the skills students need to be successful, a set of mini-tasks to guide instruction, and a scoring guide or rubric to help assess the students’ rate of success. All of Madison’s teachers will be exposed to these teaching tasks in school year 2012-2013.

Functioning as a Professional Learning Community, the Madison faculty will meet monthly with departments in school year 2012-2013. This time will be utilized to share best practice, plan together, disaggregate data, align curriculum, unpack Common Core Standards, and create/analyze common assessments. Teachers will also participate in a cross-curricular team of teachers who share at least some common students. This team will identify students who scored in the lowest 25% on FCAT 2.0 Reading whom they can impact through instruction and/or mentoring. Collaborative tracking of these students’ data will assist with targeting the individual student’s needs. These small groups will meet each Thursday, while the faculty meets together each Tuesday morning prior to school.

Realizing that all aspects of learning are critical to student development, Madison provides opportunities for extended school enrichment. These activities address interests of many students to include: Basketball, Track, Cheerleading, Forensics, National Junior Honor Society, Odyssey of the Mind, Lego Robotics Team, SECME, Band, Chorus, Orchestra, Guitar, and Mohawk Patrol.

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

Members of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning, which was established in 1991 by Congress to conduct a comprehensive study of the relationship between learning and scheduled time in America's schools, reported that "the degree to which today's American school is controlled by the dynamics of clock and calendar is surprising, even to people who understand school operations". [National Education Commission on Time and Learning, 1994, p.7]

Schools on a traditional schedule were found to have specific scheduling criticisms to include the following: 1. Contributing to impersonal nature; 2. Exacerbating discipline problems directly related to transitions/class changes; 3. Offering less room for any electives with increased curricular/graduation requirements; 4. Limiting instructional possibilities for teachers. A block schedule can work to the benefit of all of the criticisms noted. However, for a block schedule school to succeed, teachers must alter their techniques to utilize extended blocks of time effectively. They cannot simply "dispense knowledge in lecture format, assign and grade homework/class work, and give quizzes/tests" as is common in many secondary traditional scheduled schools. Teachers who are most successful in block scheduling typically plan lessons in multiple chunks: Direct instruction, application "hands-on", and synthesis utilizing such instructional strategies as reviewed in B.E.S.T.: relationship/class/team building, cooperative learning, Socratic/Paideia Seminars, inquiry-based instruction, simulations, technology, and learning centers/stations. [Block Scheduling: A Catalyst for Change in High Schools, 1995]

Increased time per class period provides teachers more opportunities to individualize instruction, time to fully understand the specific learning needs of students. It also allows students more chances to receive personalized differentiated instruction. New York University, in 2008, addressed the use of Differentiated Instruction as an approach to teaching and learning for students with different abilities in the same classroom. The theory behind differentiated instruction is that teachers should vary and adapt their approaches to fit the vast diversity of students in the classroom. Differentiated instruction recognizes that students differ in many ways, including prior knowledge, culture, learning preferences and interests. The block schedule allows greater opportunity for all students to learn on their level, and requires that teachers must change the way they teach in a traditional schedule. Block scheduling allows a workshop environment that can contribute to the success of differentiated instruction. (Hess, 1999)

While there is no recipe for differentiation, there are certain broad principles and characteristics involved. Teachers must ensure "respectful activities" for all students, allow for flexible clusters of students, and recognize and embrace cultural diversity within the classroom. (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) Student readiness and interest are key components to consider when preparing for the differentiated classroom and differentiation can occur through content, process, and products. "The goal of differentiated instruction is to make certain that everyone grows in all key skills and knowledge areas, moving on from the students' starting points to achieve academic excellence, personal success and self discipline by utilizing higher order thinking skills for real world problem solving. Teachers guide students to explore topics through a teaching approach that best meets their learning style, while examining the values, beliefs, and ideas that shape their experiences." (How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms, 2001)

According to Carol Ann Tomlinson, "the need for emotional safety, appropriate challenge, and self-constructed meaning suggests that a one-size-fits-all approach to classroom teaching is ineffective for most students and harmful to some. In order to create meaning in each individual brain, learners need entryways to make sense of the world around them. They need a brain-friendly classroom in which instruction is varied, diversified, and differentiated. Because differentiation provides this variation, it fully supports the uniqueness of every brain." [Supporting Differentiated Instruction: A Professional Learning Communities Approach, 2011]

## CONTENT AREA:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Parental Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Drop-out Programs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arts/PE	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		

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

Every teacher at James Madison Middle School will use Differentiated Instruction effectively to actively engage students bell to bell.

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

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Timetable</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>In-Process Measure</b>
Teacher Buy-in Lack of Application	1. Provide Professional Development on Differentiated Instruction during faculty meetings - to include BEST strategies	Sherry Tomlinson and Sharon Tolson	Monthly: 9/18; 10/16; 11/13; 1/22; 2/19; 3/19;	0	Inservice Records
Teacher Buy-in Lack of Application	2. Provide "Engaging Students within Block Schedule" Professional Development	Dr. Queen	10/11 and 10/12	\$2400.00 from district	Attendance sheet
Teacher Availability	3. Sharing of information from MESH teachers who attend Block Scheduling professional development with departments	MESH trained teachers	Department meetings October through May	0	Department agenda
Faculty not reading/studying assigned chapters Lack of application	4. Book study: <i>How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms</i>	Sherry Tomlinson and Sharon Tolson	Tuesdays of each month beginning 8-28; 9/18; 10/16; 11/13; 1/22; 2/19; 3/19;	Books borrowed from another school	Faculty Meeting attendance sign in sheet
Teacher resistance to Reading Coach Input	5. Utilize Reading Coach to model engagement strategies and Differentiated Instruction techniques	Rhonda Marynec	On-going August through May	0	Calendar and/or Coach's log
Teacher Buy-in Lack of Application	6. Provide "School-wide Discipline" Professional Development	Ron Shaw	October 12	0	Inservice Records
Teacher	7. Provide	Joyce Smolik	November 9	Title II Grant will	Meeting Agenda

Availability	vertical articulation for science departments of Astronaut High School and Madison Middle School			Fund Substitutes	
Teacher Buy-in Lack of Application	8. Provide district resource support for Common Core math implementation	Sherry Tomlinson Kim Bragg	November 15 and December 4	Title II Grant will Fund Substitutes	Meeting Agenda
Availability of District Personnel	9. Provide district resource support for Common Core ELA implementation across content areas as well as engagement strategies for the block schedule	Sherry Tomlinson Nancy Gray District Resource Teachers	Faculty meeting September 4, 2012 and Department Meetings Ongoing (to include August 21)	0	Faculty attendance

## **EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection**

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

Qualitative Professional Practice Outcome: Due to an increase in bell-to-bell active student engagement lessons with use of differentiated instruction, the faculty at James Madison Middle School will trust their peers to observe them and provide feedback to them; allowing for honest reflection; showing pride in their students’ growth along with ownership of their own professional growth.

Quantitative Professional Practice Outcome: There will be an increase in bell-to-bell active student engagement lessons with use of differentiated instruction, evidenced through at least 75% of teacher Professional Growth Plan (PGP) goals [tied to this School Improvement Plan] being met.

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

Qualitative Student Achievement Expectations: Due to an increase in bell-to-bell active student engagement lessons with use of differentiated instruction, the students at James Madison Middle School will show improvement in their behavior, academics, and attendance.

Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: Due to an increase in bell-to-bell active student engagement lessons with use of differentiated instruction, in 2012-2013, James Madison Middle School will earn enough points to merit being awarded an “A” school under Florida’s grading system.

# APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

<p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;">Reading Goal:  <b>Madison will increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above from 59% to 64% as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;"><b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b>  <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small></p>	<p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;"><b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b>  <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small></p>
<p><b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time to incorporate additional reading or DI strategies into instructional time.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporate higher level questioning.</li> <li>2. Utilize the FCAT 2.0 data from the FLDOE website to plan lessons that correlate with the Next Generation Florida Sunshine State Standards.</li> <li>3. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students through Differentiated Instruction.</li> <li>4. Align curriculum with Common Core Standards.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 and above</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Stress from additional expectations on teachers</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students</li> </ol>	<p>59% = 264 students out of 446 students</p>	<p>64% = 319 students out of 498 students</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students</li> </ol>	<p>11% = 1 student out of 9 students</p>	<p>10% = 1 student out of 10 students</p>
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Competition with area programs for high level students, such as Cambridge Program at Jackson Middle School and the IB Program at Edgewood Jr./Sr. High School.</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make our College Readiness Program appealing to our community so that parents will choose our school for their high level students.</li> </ol>	<p>26% = 116 students out of 446 students</p>	<p>34% = 170 students out of 498 students</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s)</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students</li> </ol>	<p>67% = 6 students out of 9 students</p>	<p>70% = 7 students out of 10 students</p>

<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students</p>	<p>86% = 6 students out of 7 students</p>	<p>90% = 9 students out of 10 students</p>
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Time to work with/mentor students individually</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. PLC Members will adopt a small group of students from the lowest 25% list and will mentor and encourage them to make learning gains</p>	<p>59% = 59 students out of 100 students</p>	<p>64% = 69 students out of 107 students</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students</p>	<p>86% = 6 students out of 7 students</p>	<p>90% = 9 students out of 10 students</p>
<p><b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b>  2012-2013 64%  2013-2014 68%  2014-2015 71%  2015-2016 75%  2016-2017 79%</p> <p><b>Baseline data 2010-11: 57% Level 3 and above;</b>  <b>2011-12 60% Level 3 and above</b></p>		
<p><b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>White:</u> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>Black:</u> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>Hispanic:</u> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>Asian:</u> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>American Indian:</u> →</p>	<p><b>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</b></p> <p>37% = 128 students out of 345 students</p> <p>61% = 33 students out of 53 students</p> <p>36% = 9 students out of 25 students</p> <p>0% = 0 students out of 4 students</p> <p>50% = 1 student out of 2 students</p>	<p><b>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</b></p> <p>33% = 120 students out of 362 students</p> <p>56% = 46 students out of 82 students</p> <p>33% = 6 students out of 17 students</p> <p>0% = 0 students out of 4 students</p> <p>50% = 1 student out of 2 students</p>



<b>English Language Learners</b> (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> Lack of knowledge and understanding of ELL accommodations <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Ensure that ELL accommodations are known and followed.	No data	33% = 1 student out of 3 students
<b>Students with Disabilities</b> (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> Improper grouping and student buy-in <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students	69% = 38 students out of 55 students (including 9 FAA students)	59% = 66 students out of 111 students (including 10 FAA students)
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> Improper grouping and student buy-in <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students	48% = 102 students out of 212 students	43% = 119 students out of 275 students

### Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Book Study and Professional Development with Sharon Tolson: How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms by Carol Tomlinson	9/18; 10/16; 11/13; 1/22; 2/19; 3/19	Teachers will implement differentiated instructional techniques so that all students learning needs and learning styles are met.
Block Scheduling Development Training – bell to bell instruction	Department Meetings October through May	MESH teachers who attend the training will share information with their departments.

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Listening/ Speaking:</b> None	Teacher Lack of Understanding of ELL accommodations	Ensure ELL accommodations are known and followed	ELL Contact
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Reading:</b> None	Teacher Lack of Understanding of ELL accommodations	Ensure ELL accommodations are known and followed	ELL Contact
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Writing:</b> None	Teacher Lack of Understanding of ELL accommodations	Ensure ELL accommodations are known and followed	ELL Contact

<b>Mathematics Goal(s):</b> <b>Madison will increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above from 59% to 66% as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> 1. Student buy-in. 2. Improper grouping.		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.		
<b>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> 1. Improper grouping.  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	59% = 261 students out of 442 students	66% = 329 students out of 498 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	22% = 2 students out of 9 students	30% = 3 students out of 10 students
<b>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> 1. Improper grouping. 2. Student buy-in.  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 2. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	19% = 84 students out of 442 students	28% = 140 students out of 498 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	67% = 6 students out of 9 students	70% = 7 students out of 10 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions	86% = 6 students out of 7 students	90% = 9 students out of 10 students

<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> <b>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	45% = 45 students out of 100 students	51% = 53 students out of 104 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> <b>Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</b>  <b>Barrier(s):</b> Engaging students who have difficulties listening and following directions  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.	86% = 6 students out of 7 students	90% = 9 students out of 10 students
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b> 2012-2013 66% 2013-2014 69% 2014-2015 73% 2015-2016 76% 2016-2017 80%  <b>Baseline Data 2010-11: 59% Level 3 and above</b> <b>2011-12 59% Level 3 and above</b>		
<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math :</b>  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>White:</b> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Black:</b> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Hispanic:</b> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Asian:</b> →</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>American Indian:</b> →</p>	<p>39% = 133 students out of 341 students</p> <p>52% = 28 students out of 53 students</p> <p>40% = 10 students out of 25 students</p> <p>0% = 0 students out of 4 students</p> <p>50% = 1 student out of 2 students</p>	<p>32% = 116 students out of 362 students</p> <p>48% = 40 students out of 82 students</p> <p>26% = 5 students out of 17 students</p> <p>0% = 0 students out of 4 students</p> <p>50% = 1 student out of 2 students</p>
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</b>	No data	33% = 1 student out of 3 students
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</b>	67% = 37 students out of 54 students	58% = 65 students out of 111 students (including 10 FAA)

	(including 9 FAA)	
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</b>	53% = 111 students out of 209 students	41% = 113 students of 275 students

### **Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>PD Content/Topic/Focus</b>	<b>Target Dates/Schedule</b>	<b>Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring</b>
Curriculum Guide and Math Common Core	November 15, December 4	Dept meetings
Book Study with Sharon Tolson: How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms	9/18; 10/16; 11/13; 1/22; 2/19; 3/19	Teachers will implement differentiated instructional techniques so that all students learning needs and learning styles are met.
Block Scheduling Development Training – bell to bell instruction	Department Meetings October through May	MESH teachers who attend the training will share information with their departments.

<b>Writing Goal:</b> <b>Madison will increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above from 80% to 82% as measured on the 2013 FCAT Writes.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b> Time to meet with individual students  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Provide individual writing conferencing		
<b>FCAT:</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	80% = 176 students out of 220 students	82% = 206 students out of 251 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	80% = 4 students out of 5 students	83% = 5 out of 6 students

<b>Science Goal(s)</b> <b>(Elementary and Middle)</b> <b>Madison will increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above from 48% to 54% as measured by FCAT 2.0 Science.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> <b>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b> 1. Possible gaps in background knowledge/teaching at elementary school level.  <b>Strategy(s):</b> Implement differentiated instruction with particular focus on the Nature of Science through engagement in hands-on instruction and inquiry, critical thinking and fluid grouping.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	48% = 106 students out of 221 students	54% = 136 students out of 251 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science:	0% = 0 students out of 5 students	10% = 1 student out of 10 students
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	7% = 16 students out of 221 students	12% = 31 students out of 251 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science:	80% = 4 students out of 5 students	83% = 5 students out of 6 students

## APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS ONLY)

Algebra 1 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)
<b>Madison will increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above from 91% to 92% as measured Algebra I EOC.</b>		
<b>Barrier(s):</b> 1. Student buy-in. 2. Improper grouping.  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Implement activity driven flexible grouping of students.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:	91% = 68 students out of 75 students	92% = 81 students out of 88 students
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	39% = 29 Students out of 75 students	45% = 40 students out of 88 students
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data</b> <b>**2011-2012**</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">91%</span>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra:  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 30%;"> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>White:</b> →</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>Black:</b> →</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>Hispanic:</b> →</p> </div> <div style="width: 30%;"> <p style="margin: 0;">8% = 5 students out of 63 students</p> <p style="margin: 0;">33% = 3 Students out of 9 students</p> <p style="margin: 0;">0% = 0 students out of 3 students</p> </div> <div style="width: 30%;"> <p style="margin: 0;">7% = 6 students out of 75 students</p> <p style="margin: 0;">17% = 1 student out of 6 students</p> <p style="margin: 0;">0% = 0 students out of 1 student</p> </div> </div>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	No data	No data
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	No data	No data
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	12% = 3 students out of 25 students	10% = 3 students out of 31 students

Geometry EOC Goal  N/A	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)
<b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 20px; display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 10px;"></div>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  <div style="text-align: right; margin-right: 20px;"> <u>White:</u> →  <u>Black:</u> →  <u>Hispanic:</u> →           </div>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

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

<b>U.S. History EOC</b>  <b>N/A</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> (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:		

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



Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)  N/A	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

### N/A

#### (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 its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

James Madison Middle School has small collaborative teams which meet as Professional Learning Communities on Thursday mornings. It is noted that these teams could be much more effective if the majority of their students were shared and it is a goal of Madison Middle to eventually be able to “team” students. Teachers within this cross-curricular team then identify students whose data reveal that they are not as successful as their peers (behavior or academic or both). Interventions are identified and implemented through teacher collaboration.

If the response to the interventions is not successful as compared to the rest of the class (with at least 80% of the rest of the class proving success), the student's data is then brought before the MTSS leadership team (to include any and all of the following individuals: administrator, school counselor, reading coach, ESE coordinator, GSP counselor, staffing specialist, school psychologist, school behavior analyst, classroom teachers) to further diagnose and provide more intensive interventions, moving the student into receiving Tier II interventions or beyond. Madison’s MTSS Leadership team utilizes the Problem Solving Steps - 1. Problem Identification (What's the problem?) 2. Problem Analysis (Why is it occurring?) 3. Intervention Design (What are we going to do about it?) 4. Response to Intervention (Is it working?)

Teachers maintain data on the Edline/A3 data system. In addition, some teachers work with students to set goals and track their own progress. Data is disaggregated and utilized as the needs assessments to drive all school improvement decisions. The MTSS Leadership Team participates in data analysis which helps to decide the necessary professional development to support better instruction in addition to identifying objectives for the year. Faculty is invited to help develop the focus of the School Improvement Plan through disaggregation of data. The School Improvement Plan draft is presented to the faculty for input and to ensure proper monitoring.

Madison Middle School's Principal attended Response to Intervention (RtI) training on November 18, 2009 when it was first introduced from the district level. This information was brought back to the Madison campus. A RtI Leadership Team was formed. The RtI Leadership Team attended district training in September of 2010 and understanding of the MTSS process is still ongoing with support from Madison's staffing specialist. The below is data relative to the last two years of students:

	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
7th Grade Retentions	35	7
8th Grade Retentions	21	10
TOTAL Retentions	56	17
7th Grade Good Cause Exemptions	37	39
8th Grade Good Cause Exemptions	29	38
TOTAL Good Cause Exemptions	66	77
<b>7th Grade</b>		
7th Grade First Semester # Fs	118	71
8th Grade First Semester # Fs	38	41
<b>8th Grade</b>		
7th Grade Second Semester # Fs	161	74
8th Grade Second Semester # Fs	81	58
<b>7th Grade</b>		
7th Grade First Semester # Students with Fs	56	38
8th Grade First Semester # Students with Fs	36	22
<b>8th Grade</b>		
7th Grade Second Semester # Students with Fs	71	36
8th Grade Second Semester # Students with Fs	51	42
<b>7th Grade</b>		
7th Grade Final # Fs	85	37
8th Grade Final # Fs	36	20
<b>8th Grade</b>		
7th Grade Final # Students with Fs	38	17
8th Grade Final # Students with Fs	23	11

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:**

Involving parents and community members in school activities and decision making strengthens and improves student achievement according to Cook Herman, Phillips, and Settersten (2002). Englund, Luckner, Whaley and Byron (2004) found communication between the parent and teacher, parent's communication with their child at home, hours parents volunteered in schools or school functions, attendance at conferences, helping with homework, and parental expectations regarding educational achievement positively affected student achievement.

According to Williams and Chavkin (1989), "Essential Elements of Strong Parent Involvement Programs", the more parents participate in schooling, in a sustained way, at every level – in advocacy, decision-making, and oversight roles, as fund-raisers and boosters, as volunteers and paraprofessionals, and as home teachers – the better for student achievement.

Dr. Joyce Epstein maps out the six essential types of parental involvement which include

1. Parenting-help all families establish home environments
2. Communication - design effective forms of school-to-home and home-to-school communications about school programs and children's progress.
3. Volunteering - recruit and organize parent help and support.
4. Learning at home - provide information and ideas to families about how to help students at home with homework and other curriculum-related activities, decisions, and planning.
5. Decision-Making - include parents in school decisions, developing parent leaders and representatives.
6. Collaborating with Community -identify and integrate resources and services from the community to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning and development.

Parent and community members are encouraged to participate in school activities and to volunteer. Volunteers documented 7,852.98 hours during the 2010-2011 school year, and 9829.4 hours during the 2011-2012 school year. Madison sets up a table at registration to encourage parents to sign up to volunteer, and information for volunteering is shared during times such as Open House. Parents and community members assisted teachers by chaperoning field trips, assisting with tutoring, fundraising, and collecting materials and supplies for needy students. Many parents visited Madison for our Back to School Night, Parent Conference Night and Awards Night. Astronaut High School students also volunteer on the campus of Madison Middle School.

Madison Middle School utilizes planners for students to document information in for parents. In addition, teachers' use of Edline is an effective manner of sharing information with parents. Madison also electronically posts date and announcement updates weekly in Edline for parents and prints and sends home a monthly newsletter. Synervoice (an electronic system which calls the student's home) is utilized for important information sharing, as is Madison's marquee.

Parents, staff, students, and community members are encouraged to participate in the School Advisory Council. Parents are encouraged to contact the teacher or school with any concerns or questions, and we utilize a parent to represent Madison at BPS parent meetings.

Madison Middle School maintains a closet of donated clothing for students in need, and also maintains some school supplies. In addition, Brevard County offers a website, "Center for the Whole Child Connection", to assist families in learning the resources available for them.

One hundred eighty-eight parents responded to the 2011-2012 BPS Parent Survey (compared to 94 in 2010-2011). Parents indicated that the best ways to communicate with them are email and Edline. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of parents responded either "Good" (14.4%) or "Excellent" (84.6%) to the question, "When you visit your child's school, how welcoming is the front office staff?". Nearly 77% percent responded that they have attended an informational meeting or academic event at Madison, and 87% stated that the information was useful. Tuesday mornings, Saturday afternoons, and Thursday evenings were the times noted as best for school events, with the evening times getting the most responses. Forty-five percent of those who responded stated that they feel well informed and satisfied with their level of participation in school decision making, while another 19% responded that they participate and feel valued. Approximately 15% stated that they do not have time to participate, and another 9% (8.8%) stated that they prefer not to be involved in decision making.

**ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)**

James Madison Middle School students missed a total of 2837 unexcused days from school during the 2011-12 school year, while compiling 675 tardies. This was a huge loss of instructional time. As of the first nine weeks (August/September) of the 2012-13 school year, Madison students have compiled 390 unexcused absences and 118 tardies. The district report for the first 20 days of attendance in 2012-2013 shows that Madison Middle School has the lowest rate of attendance of any regular public school in Brevard (94.41%). This is a decline as in school year 2011-2012, Madison achieved 96.52%. Classroom teachers and administration continue to track data to monitor student attendance. In addition, the District Truancy Office conducts home visits.

**SUSPENSION:**

James Madison Middle School students were referred to the front office 983 times for disciplinary reasons during the 2011-12 School year, earning a total of 586 suspension days for 113 students. Madison’s 2011-12 discipline data for the entire year was reviewed with the faculty, with special attention given to peak months (October, February, March). It is recognized through the student surveys as well as the discipline data indicates that student behavior is impacting student achievement on Madison’s campus.

Month	Data	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Average
	Incident #	N/A	N/A	1094	901		997.5
	Student #	N/A	N/A	220	182		201
August							
	Incident #	1	16	23	31	35	21.2
	Student #	1	13	20	23	27	16.8
September							
	Incident #	103	91	64	99	129	97.2
	Student #	51	50	49	48	79	55.4
<b>*October*</b>							
	Incident #	203	128	104	<b>139</b>		143.5
	Student #	<b>93</b>	64	65	<b>75</b>		74.25
November							
	Incident #	146	91	98	112		111.75
	Student #	70	54	71	59		63.5
December							
	Incident #	125	74	59	67		81.25
	Student #	77	54	40	42		53.25
January							
	Incident #	135	103	122	64		106
	Student #	69	57	80	46		63
<b>*February*</b>							
	Incident #	<b>413</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>165</b>	94		208
	Student #	<b>127</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>92</b>	57		89.25
<b>*March*</b>							
	Incident #	<b>238</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>114</b>		165
	Student #	<b>92</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>72</b>		81.25
April							
	Incident #	129	123	147	96		123.75

Student #	72	66	81	58		69.25
May						
Incident #	137	74	132	71		103.5
Student #	82	53	76	52		65.75

Discipline Referrals		2011	2012
# Male Event		677	692
# Female Event		372	178
% Majority Event		66%	70%
	# White	693	609
% Minority Event		44%	30%
	# Asian	2	1
	# Black	249	187
	# Hispanic	54	34
	# Indian	13	13
	# Mixed	40	26

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only):**

**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.)**