

Charlotte County Public Schools

# L. A. Ainger Middle School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>13</b> |

## L. A. Ainger Middle School

245 COUGAR WAY, Rotonda West, FL 33947

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/lam>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 72%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 14%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | B       | B       | B*      |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/9/2018.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

To promote TRUST, RESPECT, ACHIEVEMENT, CHARACTER, and KINDNESS in a positive culture that inspires SUCCESS for ALL.

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

Student Success!

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name            | Title               |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Harvey, Jeff    | Principal           |
| Konrardy, Daryl | Assistant Principal |
| Murnighan, Mary | Teacher, K-12       |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Total oversight in running all aspects of the school house. This includes but is not limited to the following: Maintaining a culture of academic excellence. Compliance with state and district initiatives and testing. A budget that is accurate and compliant with all laws and regulations. Safety and security for all students and staff as a top priority. Taking responsibility for professional development of staff. Providing for the needs of the classroom, where possible. Having a clean and pleasant environment that instills an atmosphere of order and pride. Providing opportunities for shared leadership and collaboration with the staff. Responsible for all staff evaluations. Facilitate and encourage parent involvement on many levels including volunteerism, SAC and PTO. Initiate and foster community partnerships. Encourage staff to innovate and create 21st century opportunities for the their students.

### Early Warning Systems

#### Year 2017-18

##### 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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 32 | 31 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 34 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 63    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 71 | 38 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 149   |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 35 | 37 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116 |       |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2 |       |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1 |       |

**Date this data was collected**

Tuesday 8/14/2018

**Year 2016-17 - As Reported**

**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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102 |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 9  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 11 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 35 | 45 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113 |       |
| 3 or more Referrals             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54  |       |
| Failing 2 or more Subjects      | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34  |       |
| GPA below 2.0                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83  |       |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 48 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108 |       |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

**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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102 |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 9  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 11 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 35 | 45 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113 |       |
| 3 or more Referrals             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54  |       |
| Failing 2 or more Subjects      | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34  |       |
| GPA below 2.0                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83  |       |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 48 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108 |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Lowest quartile was the lowest component in FSA reporting for the 2017-18 academic year with 48% of the students earning gains. While the percentage has increased from the previous year, it continues to be the lowest component.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math lowest quartile gains dropped 3% from the previous year and overall Math gains went down 7% from the previous year.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The lowest quartile in Math showed the largest negative gap when compared to the state average. The difference was 1%.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The ELA lowest quartile increased 9% from the previous year and Acceleration increased by 19% from the previous year. The growth in ELA lowest quartile is not a trend. The growth in Acceleration is a trend.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

More students were scheduled in classes that counted toward acceleration. The growth in ELA can be attributed to a change in staff as well as intensive work in PLC meetings between ELA teachers including reflection on data collected in formative assessments and progress monitoring.

### School Data

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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 58%    | 54%      | 53%   | 56%    | 49%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 58%    | 55%      | 54%   | 53%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 48%    | 48%      | 47%   | 43%    | 41%      | 45%   |
| Math Achievement            | 66%    | 59%      | 58%   | 69%    | 59%      | 55%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 57%    | 57%      | 57%   | 69%    | 61%      | 55%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50%    | 53%      | 51%   | 54%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 66%    | 57%      | 52%   | 51%    | 49%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 83%    | 80%      | 72%   | 82%    | 72%      | 67%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7       | 8       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 23 (21)                           | 32 (41) | 31 (40) | 86 (102)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 27 (6)                            | 27 (9)  | 34 (2)  | 88 (17)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 39 (6)                            | 11 (11) | 13 (19) | 63 (36)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 40 (33)                           | 71 (35) | 38 (45) | 149 (113) |

### Grade Level Data

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2018 | 58%    | 48%      | 10%                        | 52%   | 6%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 56%    | 52%      | 4%                         | 52%   | 4%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 49%    | 51%      | -2%                        | 51%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 49%    | 45%      | 4%                         | 52%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 63%    | 57%      | 6%                         | 58%   | 5%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 53%    | 52%      | 1%                         | 55%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 14%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2018 | 44%    | 46%      | -2%                        | 52%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 56%    | 51%      | 5%                         | 51%   | 5%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 72%    | 64%      | 8%                         | 54%   | 18%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 64%    | 57%      | 7%                         | 53%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 61%    | 45%      | 16%                        | 45%   | 16%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 64%    | 49%      | 15%                        | 46%   | 18%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2018 | 66%    | 53%      | 13%                        | 50%   | 16%                     |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        | 81%    | 78%      | 3%                    | 71%   | 10%                |
| 2017        | 79%    | 75%      | 4%                    | 69%   | 10%                |
| Compare     |        | 2%       |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        | 99%    | 72%      | 27%                   | 62%   | 37%                |
| 2017        | 100%   | 59%      | 41%                   | 60%   | 40%                |



| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| Compare      |        | -1%      |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data

| 2018 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 44     | 45          | 39        | 47      | 39           | 35       | 62      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 55     |             | 60        | 63      | 40           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       |          |        |             |           | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 40     | 41          | 58        | 56      | 40           | 38       | 69      | 80        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 33       | 45     |             | 75        | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 60     | 47          | 66        | 57      | 51           | 72       | 84      | 72        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 53     | 47          | 57        | 53      | 50           | 53       | 80      | 56        |                   |                     |
| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 9        | 25     | 23          | 23        | 48      | 44           | 15       | 41      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 22       | 50     |             | 44        | 50      |              |          | 69      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 39     | 32          | 52        | 53      | 44           | 67       | 53      | 47        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 36       | 38     |             | 46        | 62      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 51     | 41          | 68        | 66      | 54           | 59       | 84      | 56        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 42     | 37          | 56        | 60      | 55           | 51       | 69      | 32        |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

### Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1                   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Diminishing the gaps in the Students With Disabilities/Without Disabilities subgroup identified by the State Board by increasing ELA Achievement and increasing ELA Gains.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | After examining data in Section II D of this document, a determination was made to focus on this gaps in performance between the Students With/Without Disabilities.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Diminish the gaps by 8% in the next year.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Block scheduling for the lowest quartile in ELA and a change in staffing in ELA will facilitate in the slimming of the gap for students in the subgroup.<br>Identifying and implementing best practices to differentiate instruction to challenge students appropriately based on current ability.<br>Using small group instruction to target student deficiencies in ELA.       |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Teachers will use formative assessments and progress monitoring tools to determine areas of student deficiency.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| Activity #2                   |  |
| <b>Title</b>                  | Increasing the growth of students in the ELA lowest quartile.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | After examining data in Section II B of this document, a determination was made to increase the percentage of students demonstrating gains in ELA lowest quartile.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Increase the ELA lowest quartile gains by 5% from 48% of the students making gains in 2017-18 to 53% of the students demonstrating learning gains in 2018-19.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Block scheduling for the lowest quartile in ELA and a change in staffing in ELA will help increase the number of students making gains in the lowest quartile.<br>Identifying and implementing best practices to differentiate instruction to challenge students appropriately based on current ability.<br>Using small group instruction to target student deficiencies in ELA. |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Teachers will use formative assessments and progress monitoring tools to determine areas of student deficiency.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |

### Activity #3

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>     | Increase the growth of students in the Math lowest quartile.   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | After examining data in Section II B of this document, a determination was made to focus on increasing the learning gains in Math lowest quartile. |

**Intended Outcome** Increase the percentage of Math lowest quartile gains by 4%.

**Point Person** Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

### Action Step

**Description** Khan Academy and USA Test Prep in computer classes will supplement math instruction. Staffing has been changed within the math department. Teachers have implemented SIM strategies into their classroom instruction. The math department also offers math help 5 days a week before and after school.

**Person Responsible** Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Teachers will use formative assessments and progress monitoring tools (USA Test Prep) to determine areas of student deficiency.

**Person Responsible** Jeff Harvey (jeffrey.harvey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

### Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

L.A. Ainger Middle School consistently works to build positive family relationships with monthly S.A.C & P.T.O meetings. Through monthly S.A.C. meetings, presentations are given by school faculty and administration to update families on the latest information regarding school news & data. Parents are given the opportunity to meet with school administration regarding school feedback and concerns. Sub-committees are also formed to prepare and implement The School Improvement Plan along with other various committees. Parents and guardians are also given the opportunity to participate in our school P.T.O where family nights and fundraisers are organized. Events such as 3k runs, Family Nights, Fundraisers, and classroom projects are all discussed and organized with the collaboration of parents. Through these discussions, L.A. Ainger Middle School and it's families have worked together to increase family involvement by 80% over previous year in our Annual 3k Run, offered 7 sources of communication to parents via: email, social media, texting & online portals. These communication avenues have eliminated barriers to keeping our families informed of school events.

### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The faculty and staff are updated and provided professional development to support the social/emotional needs of all of our students. All staff members are required to participate in statewide training to recognize and report issues of Child Abuse and Neglect. Staff members are made aware of their responsibility to report issues of concern to the school's guidance counselors, social worker, and administration. L.A. Ainger has a Student Assistance Team made up of administrators, guidance counselors, social worker, nurse, school resource officer, and an ESE Liaison. This team meets weekly to address individual and school wide concerns involving our students' social/emotional well being, and early warning indicators. L.A. Ainger has a school social worker on campus 2 days a week who provides counseling, risk assessments, and interventions. The school psychologist provides observations, evaluations, and interventions as needed.

In addition to the variety of school-based interventions facilitated by the Student Assistance Team, L.A. Ainger has partnerships with outside agencies that work with our students including Big Brothers and Big Sisters, Charlotte County Behavioral Health, Department of Children and Families, Department of Juvenile Justice, Charlotte County Guardian Ad Litem, Lutheran Services of Florida, and Safe Place and Rape Crisis Center (SPARCC).

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Open Houses: Separate 6th grade Open House for 7th and 8th grade

Step Up Day for future 6th graders

Articulation Plan with LBHS to include parent information nights, LBHS guidance counselors present registration options to students in March. 8th grade students participate in a field trip to LBHS and enjoy a tour of the school and a session with Manta Mentors, elective presentations and a pep rally.

Registration night at LBHS includes personal registration time with a staff member.

All Englewood Principals (5) meet five times per year to discuss trends, needs, and collaborative activities planned for this year.

New School Newsletter is mailed to all 5th grade students as well as our students (Grade 6,7,8) three times per year.

There will be multiple visitations to feeder elementary schools by school staff.

Videos of L.A. Ainger school culture will be played at elementary schools.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The foundational piece of aligning resources (personnel, instructional, curricular) is the Master Schedule. Student populations vary and resources made available are continually in a state of flux. These in large measure depend on state and district funding, student needs, and budget. Goal setting and prioritizing each year to align resources to the needs of our students is fundamental. Student Success! is always our primary focus.." shared leadership" has been the model for the past 11 years. We have our PPC (ALC-Ainger Leadership Council) that serves as the collaborative body that combines teacher leadership and administrative leadership and decision making on matters that impact the overall climate and success of our school. This collaborative body meets monthly as well as designated ALC workdays and decides on strategies that impact both teaching and learning, such as professional development, School Improvement Plan, and general management issues such as mid-term and final exam schedules as one example. We also have our PLC (Professional Learning Community) Leaders as a leadership group. Our

school decided to designate Wednesdays as our PLC day every other week. These meetings start at 8:00am and end at 9:00am. This has been very successful in carving out time for our PLCs to work on the standards, collaborate on best practices, and have grade level PLC collaboration and planning opportunities. Always our guiding principal is Student Success!

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Teachers in the core academics strive to provide relevance in their instruction whenever possible. From guest speakers to utilization of technology, teachers continue to connect the core academics to real world application. Exploratory teachers in STEAM, the arts, music, physical education, and consumer science work collaboratively with core academic teachers to connect real world application not only in their exploratory courses but in the core academics. Real world application continues to be an emphasis with our exploratory PLC to ensure students understand the relationship between school and their future. Computer classes provides in-depth career research and meaningful analysis of personality traits in relation to career opportunities. MyCareerShines continues to be implemented.

### Part V: Budget

Total:

\$1,733.12