

Brevard Public Schools

# Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School

2155 CROTON RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

## Demographics

Principal: Marina Saporito Middleton S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>7-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 64%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (47%)<br>2020-21: (38%)<br>2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Johnson Middle School strives to provide all students limitless opportunities to succeed.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Johnson Middle School is committed to providing all students limitless opportunities to succeed.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Middleton, Marina | Principal           | Manage and administer the overall activities of assessing, developing and implementing instructional and school programs. Ensure compliance with Board rules and applicable federal laws and regulations. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.  |
| Tracy, Kavitha    | Assistant Principal | Support the Principal to cultivate a collaborative working environment. Coordinate and monitor the development and implementation of school instructional goals, strategies and outcome measures. Monitor the school improvement planning process. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.   |
| Foster, Bruna     | Dean                | Student supervision, review and analyze data to facilitate student behavior change, participate in the development and implementation of all school practices and the implementation of school-site safety programs and appropriate drills. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.                          |
| Scott, Roberta    | Instructional Coach | Plan and implement professional development opportunities that address both current research and future instructional needs. Provide direct, classroom-based, professional development for teachers through regular modeling of research-based literacy instruction. Manage and coordinate district, state and national testing. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures. |
| Latorre, Rayna    | Teacher, K-12       | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.  |
| Ford, Holly       | Instructional Media | Plan standards based lessons, with the use of appropriate instructional strategies and materials for relevant educational learning experiences. Enforce federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.  |
| Harvey, Tiffany   | Teacher, K-12       | Assist with student supervision, review and analyze data to facilitate student behavior change, participate in the   |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|

development and implementation of all school practices and the implementation of school-site safety programs. Maintain records as required. Enforce all federal, state and district regulations, policies and procedures.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Marina Saporito Middleton S

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

18

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

607

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

9

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

3

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 | 316 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 607   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 100   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33  | 47  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18  | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 13  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  | 72  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 118   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49  | 74  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 123   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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



| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 | 340 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 688   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 120   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 48  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 16  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73  | 88  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 161   |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74  | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 149   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 75 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 148   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 8  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 | 340 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 688 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 120 |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 48  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 78  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 20  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 16  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 35  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0   |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73  | 88  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 161 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74  | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 149 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 75 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 148 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    | Total |    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 8  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28 |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 49%    |          |       | 41%    |          |       | 58%    | 59%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 46%    |          |       | 37%    |          |       | 57%    | 56%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 35%    |          |       | 25%    |          |       | 49%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    |          |       | 41%    |          |       | 68%    | 66%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 45%    |          |       | 27%    |          |       | 61%    | 55%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 31%    |          |       | 27%    |          |       | 42%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 42%    |          |       | 38%    |          |       | 51%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 64%    |          |       | 55%    |          |       | 65%    | 75%      | 72%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| <b>ELA</b>        |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 54%           | 58%             | -4%                               | 52%          | 2%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 57%           | 63%             | -6%                               | 56%          | 1%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -54%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>       |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 64%           | 62%             | 2%                                | 54%          | 10%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 20%           | 43%             | -23%                              | 46%          | -26%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -64%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 48%           | 53%             | -5%                               | 48%          | 0%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2022               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>CIVICS EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>       | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2022              |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019              | 64%           | 74%             | -10%                         | 71%          | -7%                       |

| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 93%    | 61%      | 32%                   | 61%   | 32%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 100%   | 60%      | 40%                   | 57%   | 43%                |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 16       | 32     | 26          | 18        | 27      | 25           | 23       | 42      | 47        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 48     | 41          | 44        | 43      | 19           | 25       | 60      | 59        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 71       | 57     |             | 81        | 76      |              | 67       |         | 80        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 40     | 16          | 36        | 45      | 36           | 27       | 56      | 78        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 39       | 43     | 38          | 40        | 41      | 29           | 41       | 55      | 63        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 48       | 37     | 23          | 47        | 44      | 13           | 40       | 63      | 64        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 49     | 41          | 52        | 44      | 32           | 44       | 69      | 63        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 44     | 34          | 42        | 41      | 30           | 31       | 62      | 59        |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 9        | 19     | 17          | 13        | 31      | 30           | 11       | 28      | 20        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 36     | 35          | 28        | 27      | 17           | 14       | 35      | 44        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 53       | 47     |             | 58        | 39      |              |          | 58      | 64        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 27       | 25     | 16          | 23        | 24      | 29           | 13       | 38      | 32        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 37       | 41     | 41          | 30        | 23      | 25           | 25       | 47      | 39        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 41       | 28     | 10          | 34        | 29      | 33           | 37       | 35      | 54        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 38     | 22          | 48        | 29      | 28           | 46       | 64      | 48        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 32     | 25          | 29        | 25      | 25           | 28       | 44      | 32        |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 20       | 41     | 41          | 28        | 39      | 33           | 26       | 26      | 75        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 39       | 55     | 47          | 52        | 53      | 33           | 33       | 40      |           |                   |                     |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| ASN                                       | 75       | 56     |             | 80        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 46     | 48          | 44        | 51      | 43           | 19       | 38      | 80        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 59       | 59     | 53          | 63        | 64      | 40           | 42       | 65      | 82        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 53     | 50          | 60        | 56      | 44           | 32       | 69      | 93        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 59     | 50          | 73        | 62      | 43           | 60       | 69      | 86        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 48     | 44          | 56        | 55      | 41           | 39       | 55      | 76        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 45   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 24   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 449  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 28   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 1    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 40   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 72   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0    |

| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 41  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 41  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 42  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| <b>White Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 50  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| <b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 41  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

When analyzing our 2022-2023 school assessment data across subgroups and core content areas a recurring trend occurs that our English language learner students and our students with disabilities consistently perform significantly below district and state averages. In comparison with the 2021-2022 data, both the English language learners (ELL) and students with disabilities subgroups did not show significant learning gains. The economically disadvantaged students did show improvement however, it would be negligent to lose focus on this group as to ensure these students continue to perform at or above district and state averages.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Progress monitoring and state assessment data reveal that our Students with Disabilities subgroup as well as students in our English language learners subgroup show the greatest need for improvement in all areas.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Inconsistent attendance and staffing shortages were contributing factors to this need for improvement in each subgroup. English language learner (ELL) and economically disadvantaged students often lack resources and support at home. Many of our ELL students reside in households new to the country and may not have permanent living situations. They are not always able to attend extra help sessions outside of the school day and are likely affected more by inconsistent attendance and staffing shortages. Providing extra help and/or language support within students' schedules was also a barrier due to lack of consistent attendance for these specific subgroups.

Maintaining focus on these three particular subgroups by schoolwide implementation of both team and department planning to identify the lowest 25% to implement student data driven supports. These supports include common bellwork, high expectations of standards-based instruction and utilization of a common Focus board. Scheduling has been done in a way to provide students with consistent access to our bilingual instructional assist so that more students can receive language support without missing content instruction. Additionally, establishing tutoring sessions on various days/times enables more students to attend. All students have been assigned a homeroom to assist in reviewing topics and standards taught in their classes and assist students with organization. This built in homeroom also decreases loss of instructional time for students who are frequently tardy to their first period class and miss instruction due to factors outside of their control. These supports assist in the re-teaching and reviewing of core standards.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Schoolwide Reading Benchmark scores showed that 38% of students were reading at or above grade level in the beginning of the year and increased to 49% by the end of the school year. 2022 state assessment data shows improvement overall in Reading/ELA, Science, Civics, Algebra and Geometry.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Factors that contributed to this improvement include, incorporating cross-curricular reading strategies and embedding AVID/WICOR strategies into instruction. The Literacy Coach worked alongside teachers to model and facilitate reading strategies into their content lessons. The addition of an Instructional Coach assisted in incorporating Focus Boards to support student learning by clearly stating learning standards and expectations and enabling more exposure to content level vocabulary. Additionally, implementing Focus Boards assisted students in adapting to instructional routine, procedures, and organization. PLC's and progress monitoring of common assessments also played a role as contributing factors as it enabled teachers and students to monitor student progress and create and implement appropriate intervention and enrichment lessons. Our school also began to implement data chats both in and outside of the classroom with students.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Strengthening the implementation of cross-curricular reading strategies will enable students to make connections between content areas. Students will work more on reading and test taking strategies in all classes. CTE courses will reinforce math strategies in their classes while Social Studies and Science classes will offer various assignments that build upon reading and writing strategies to assist ELA.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional Development relating to standards based instruction, schoolwide AVID strategies common planning days and periods for PLC's, and conducting data chats across curricula.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Leadership Team coaches will attend department meetings once a week to provide insight and support for standards based lesson plans, common assessments and instructional implementation. This team of coaches will also continue to work with and mentor students identified as being in the lowest 25%. This team of coaches will also conduct classroom walkthroughs alongside district resource teachers to strengthen instruction. The AVID coordinator will conduct monthly professional development to support standards based instruction. All content areas implement common bellwork as a reteach method for their curriculum.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** ESSA data indicated that our students in 2 subgroups are performing below 41% and 1 subgroup is performing at 41% . Of our student population, 28% of students with disabilities, 40% English Language Learners and 41% of economically disadvantaged are performing at or below 41% which causes our focus to be primarily on these subgroups. School-wide assessment data shows that student scores continue to be below the district and state average with only 53% of our students achieving a score that is equivalent to a passing grade in Math. Grade 8 Math, Pre-Algebra is the main area of math focus with 6% of our students performing at or above grade level. This is equivalent to the percentage of proficiency from the prior school year.

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

Due to moving to a different progress monitoring system, we are unsure of how to assess and observe a measurable outcome but strive to increase our math scores from 53% proficiency to 85% proficiency. We will increase Grade 8 math proficiency from 6% to 16%.

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

Teachers will implement common assessments within their grade level content areas to monitor student mastery of the standards and growth. Additionally, with the new implementation of the FAST progress monitoring assessment, teachers will analyze and utilize student data more frequently to identify student learning needs and differentiate instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

The math department will implement, with fidelity, AVID WICOR strategies. Teachers will develop standards-based common assessments as well as analyze data from the new FAST progress monitoring assessments. Data from these assessments will be utilized and analyzed for reteach/enrichment purposes. This monitoring will also assist in driving morning and lunch tutoring sessions as it will identify which students are in need of support outside of their scheduled instructional time. The Math department will utilize standards based bellwork focusing on strand gaps. The department will work with the CTE department on common math standards-based bellwork to reteach and review strategies

**implemented for this Area of Focus.** taught in math classes. Implementation of the support facilitation model to high needs ESE classes to support instruction and learning. Continued collaboration within departments and with district resource teachers to implement effective achievement strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Utilizing data to drive instruction will support teachers' understanding of necessary strategies to strengthen student content knowledge. Coaching and modeling the use of AVID/WICOR strategies will benefit all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Leadership Team Coaches will attend weekly department meet to assist teachers in standards-based lesson planning, data analysis.
2. AVID site coordinator will conduct WICOR strategy training throughout PLC's and Early Release PD days. Monthly faculty meetings will be centered around integrating AVID/WICOR strategies in their classrooms. These trainings are designed so that teachers are equipped to immediately implement strategies in their classrooms.
3. Support and professional development will be provided within the departments, by administration and district resource teachers.
4. Teachers will receive timely, meaningful feedback from coaches, peers and administration regarding instructional practice.
5. Teachers will focus on standards-based bellwork and focus boards to concentrate on standards based instruction and grade level assignments.
6. Teachers will identify students in ESSA subgroups and conduct data chats with them and all students to review formative assessment data.

**Person Responsible** Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ESSA data indicated that our students in 2 subgroups are performing below 41% and 1 subgroup is performing at 41% . Of our student population, 28% of students with disabilities, 40% English Language Learners and 41% of economically disadvantaged are performing at or below 41% which causes our focus to be primarily on these subgroups.

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** We will develop a consistency of growth with students with both benchmark data and learning gains. Schoolwide assessment data shows that more than 50% of our student population are below grade level based on their FSA scores. Additionally, 46% made learning gains.

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

Students will make learning gains as indicated by the scale score received on the grade level FAST assessment. Student proficiency will increase from 46% to 58%.

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

Teachers will continue to facilitate newly adopted AMPLIFY curriculum and implement common assessments within their grade level to monitor student mastery of the standards and growth. Teachers will analyze and utilize common assessment data alongside benchmark assessment data from the new FAST progress monitoring assessment to identify student learning needs and differentiate instruction. The literacy coach will monitor students on the cusp of proficiency by providing additional reading supports 2 times per week in addition to their regular core instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

PLCs will work with the literacy coach to review and analyze data in order to identify and support students on the cusp of proficiency. This team will consistently monitor and analyze progress monitoring data to drive enrichment/interventions for students. Additionally, district resource teachers are collaborating and analyzing data with ELA and IR teachers to enrich instructional strategies. Common assessment data will be utilized to identify learning gaps and drive instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the**

Potential for learning gains lies in aligning the task complexity to grade level standards. By aligning tasks to standards, with text based writing incorporated into those tasks, learning gains will increase. Implementing the AMPLIFY curriculum with fidelity will assist in solidifying standards based instruction.

**resources/  
criteria used for  
selecting this  
strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Leadership Team Coaches will attend weekly department meet to assist teachers in standards-based lesson planning, data analysis.
2. AVID site coordinator will conduct WICOR strategy training throughout PLC's and Early Release PD days. Monthly faculty meetings will be centered around integrating AVID/WICOR strategies in their classrooms. These trainings are designed so that teachers are equipped to immediately implement strategies in their classrooms.
3. Support and professional development will be provided within the departments, by administration and district resource teachers.
4. Teachers will receive timely, meaningful feedback from coaches, peers and administration regarding instructional practice.
5. Teachers will focus on common bellwork and focus boards to concentrate on standards based instruction and grade level assignments.
6. Teachers and Literacy Coach will identify students in ESSA subgroups and conduct data chats with students to review formative assessment data.

**Person  
Responsible**

Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ESSA data indicated that our students in 2 subgroups are performing below 41% and 1 subgroup is performing at 41% . Of our student population, 28% of students with disabilities, 40% English Language Learners and 41% of economically disadvantaged are performing at or below 41% which causes our focus to be primarily on these subgroups.

Schoolwide assessment data show that student scores continue to be below the district and state average with 37% proficiency.

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

Eighth grade student average will increase by 10% bringing us to 47% proficiency.

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

Teachers will implement common assessments within their grade level content areas to monitor student mastery of the standards and growth. Teachers will analyze and utilize student data to identify student learning needs and differentiate instruction. This data will also be utilized to drive common standards based bellwork to reteach and review test strands.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The Science department will implement, with fidelity, AVID WICOR strategies. Teachers will develop standards-based common assessments and data from these assessments will be utilized and analyzed for reteach/enrichment purposes. The department will utilize FSA strand data to create standards based bellwork focusing on strand gaps and implement bellwork with fidelity. Data from bellwork and common assessments will be analyzed during department meetings to assist in driving FSA strand lessons. Continued collaboration within departments and with district resource teachers to implement effective achievement strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for

Utilizing data to drive instruction will support teachers' understanding of necessary strategies to strengthen student content knowledge. Coaching and modeling the use of AVID/WICOR strategies will benefit all students. Potential for increased learning gains lies in aligning the task complexity to grade level standards. By aligning tasks to standards, with text based writing incorporated into those tasks, learning gains will increase.

**selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Leadership Team Coaches will attend weekly department meet to assist teachers in standards-based lesson planning and data analysis.
2. AVID site coordinator will conduct WICOR strategy training throughout PLC's and Early Release PD days. Monthly faculty meetings will be centered around integrating AVID/WICOR strategies in their classrooms. These trainings are designed so that teachers are equipped to immediately implement strategies in their classrooms.
3. Support and professional development will be provided within the departments, by administration and district resource teachers.
4. Teachers will receive timely, meaningful feedback from coaches, peers and administration regarding instructional practice.
5. Teachers will focus on common bellwork and focus boards to concentrate on standards based instruction and grade level assignments.
6. Teachers will identify students in ESSA subgroups and conduct data chats with students to review formative assessment data.

**Person Responsible** Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

### **Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Johnson Middle School utilizes input from various school stakeholders to improve the school culture. The administration and faculty are deliberate about building trusting and respectful relationships with students, parents and the community. Results from the Youth Truth survey, Insight Survey and Parent Survey guides discussion and the development of strategies and programs to positively impact the academic and social-emotional learning environment. Positive culture begins with positive relationships. Student mental health is a priority at Johnson. A student can successfully learn when their basic needs are being met. Students can then focus on learning with minimal preoccupation.

Overall, according to the Youth Truth Survey, student perception of the culture, engagement, academic challenge and relationships at Johnson has declined from the previous school year. Student perception has increased in the degree to which students feel welcome at our school and have collaborative relationships with their classrooms. Counselors, including our social worker are available throughout the day; one-to-one sessions, group sessions, communicating electronically and supporting both teachers and students. Staff has been trained in Trauma Informed /Compassion Fatigue and the counseling department continues to monitor and support both staff and students. This aides in students feeling safe when they come to school and the duration of the time they spend at Johnson. Additionally, Johnson Middle School has responded to the Youth Truth Survey feedback and continues to have a "True Colors Club" that welcomes students from various backgrounds and identities to come together and build a safe, positive culture for all students regardless of their differences. Teachers are teamed to further support student success and are working to incorporate more team collaboration within their classrooms and are building more team orientated competitions focused around supporting school-wide initiatives through homerooms. We are also an establish PBIS model school and implement quarterly events as well as weekly events, such as our REPPS store, to reinforce and reward students who display positive behavior. Opportunities have been created for students to attend themed events and activities in the media center in the mornings such as Kindness Club, Coding Club, Book Club and the Harris Stem Challenge.

The use of digital resources and social media help to build the connection between Johnson and the community. As indicated in the Parent Survey, electronic communication remains the best way to give and receive input with our stakeholders. The increased use of the FOCUS page and Blackboard Connect aide in frequent communication of campus-wide activities for both parents/guardians and students. Our school website and Facebook page provide additional sources of communication with all stakeholders. Johnson Middle School hosts multiple orientation nights such as our 7th grade, Cambridge and AVID orientation nights to making incoming families and their students feel welcome and part of our school community. We are also establishing more parent nights geared towards college and career readiness and AVID. Furthermore, we are also implementing spirit nights to increase community-based support for our students. Our school established a Fall and Winter Colorguard program to foster a closer partnership with our main feeder high school, Eau Gallie High Schools. This not only promotes a closer positive relationship within the community but also with our students as it builds familiarity with students as they transition to high school.

The 2022-2023 Insight survey revealed that 85% of teachers at Johnson feel that our school is committed to improving their instructional practice. This information is critical as it ensures that students are on the receiving end of teachers who feel that their school is equally committed to them as they are to their students. Additionally, 100% of the teachers at our school applied for their position rather than being places. This shows that they genuinely want to help students at Johnson and over 50% of the teachers feel that the school is a good place to teach and learn. Over 50% of the teacher population feel that their perspective is respected even when it is not aligned with the majority which bolsters a professional, positive school culture. To increase and promote a positive peer culture among our teachers, there is an established "Best of the Week" to communicate some of the positive things that occur at our school. Additionally, teachers have created the Johnson Adventure Club where opportunities are communicated to staff to build relational capacity.

### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.**

Johnson Middle School engages all families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.

Teachers communicate high expectations for all students. Teachers meet frequently to routinely examine data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. Additionally, our PBIS team meets bi-monthly to analyze discipline data and plan positive culture building activities for our school. This data includes discipline referrals, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of

what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and What needs to be done. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another. Teachers consistently implement lessons to teach and reinforce positive behavior and appropriate age level social skills.

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning, providing an opportunity for each department to meet during their planning periods. Leaders are supporting these department meetings by assisting with data analysis on student progress and conducting student led data chats to establish student accountability for their academic achievement. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all families to participate. Additionally after analyzing the insight survey, teachers have signed up to create committees to participate in specific areas of focus to address and improve upon.

Our School Advisory Council enables us to reach out to families and the community early and often to assist in problem solving areas of concern. Council members serve as a voice to the internal and external school community. It consistently seeks input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders.