Surfside Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Surfside Middle School

300 NAUTILUS ST, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

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.

The Surfside Middle School family will provide a standards-based and technology-rich curriculum to promote student learning and foster self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Surfside Middle School we will inspire children to be passionate about learning. We will challenge children to meet their potential academically and socially. Teachers will model in their relationships with students and colleagues an appreciation for the uniqueness of each individual. Teachers will collaborate among grade levels and subject areas (i.e. Professional Learning Communities) to promote learning in a safe and comfortable environment. We will engage parents, students, staff, and the community in shared responsibility for advancing the school's vision and mission.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Harrell, Sue	Principal
Pitts, David	Assistant Principal
Bull, Chris	Teacher, K-12
Cerney, Jill	Teacher, K-12
Easom, Kathy	Teacher, K-12
Wright, Martha	Teacher, K-12
Jarrard, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

The School Improvement Leadership Team (SILT) plans, organizes and conducts pre-school inservice days for our school. This includes presenting and analyzing data, discussing professional development needs, and focusing on priorities for school improvement. This leadership continues across the year, as they serve as grade level team leaders and PLC facilitators. Members model effective instructional strategies in meetings and work collaboratively with administration. they share decision-making with the administrators throughout all school processes, developing the School Improvement Plan, monitoring student progress, and designing our STEM period for enrichment, as well as remediation.

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	61	86	68	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	53	43	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	13	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	61	46	0	0	0	0	183
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	62	54	44	0	0	0	0	160

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	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected
Friday 6/1/2018

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	142	158	186	0	0	0	0	486
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	41	0	0	0	0	105
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	50	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	38	0	0	0	0	91

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	71	76	76	0	0	0	0	223

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	142	158	186	0	0	0	0	486
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	41	0	0	0	0	105
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	50	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	38	0	0	0	0	91

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	71	76	76	0	0	0	0	223

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?

Performance by Surfside students declined slightly in ELA with percent of students achieving proficiency dropping 1 point (from 64% to 63%); percent of students achieving learning gains dropping by 7points (from 64% to 57%); and percent of students in the lower quartile achieving gains dropping 3 points (from 56% to 53%). This does not appear to be a trend since these same areas achieved positive results in 2016-17

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The percent of students achieving ELA learning gains declined from 64% in 2017 to 57% in 2018

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

In comparison to state averages, our school ELA rate of proficiency was 63% (as compared to the state average of 53%). Math proficiency was at 70% for Surfside, as compared to 58% for the state, and Science proficiency was at 65%, even with the state.The largest gap was a positive gap of 12 percentage points in Math.

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

The percent of students achieving proficiency in Science increased 12 points from 2017 to 2018. Since 2015, Science achievement has risen or held steady, but this was a significant improvement. In addition, significant growth was achieved in the percent of students achieving Learning Gains in FSA Math, which increased 8 points, and in the achievement of our Lower Quartile in FSA Math, which increased 9 points. In these areas, improvement does not appear to be a trend.

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

The addition of a second Honors Physical Science class (a high school credit course) broadened the opportunity for students to go deeper into concepts and applications of their learning. In addition, many teachers used STEM activities in our 7th period enrichment time, and we enlarged our pre-engineering classes to include robotics. Each of these had an impact on keeping students focused on science. Science teachers enbedded the 5 E's as the planning guide for their instruction, while the entire faculty used the Gradual Release of Responsibility model for planning and delivering instruction. Surfside students also benefited from technology through the Chromebook initiative which provided much more practice with testing format and likely resulted in an improved comfort level with on-line testing. Focus on the standards and use of district pacing guides, along with strong PLC leadership supported the teaching and learning process as well.

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	63%	70%	60%	54%	58%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	62%	57%	56%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	55%	52%	58%	42%	49%
Math Achievement	70%	70%	61%	68%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	59%	58%	68%	60%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	62%	52%	60%	43%	48%
Science Achievement	65%	62%	57%	54%	56%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	83%	77%	77%	80%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	61 (142)	86 (158)	68 (186)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	215 (486)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	63 (29)	53 (35)	43 (41)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	159 (105)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (63)	24 (50)	13 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	52 (113)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	76 (26)	61 (27)	46 (38)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	183 (91)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	
03	2018						
	2017						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
	2017	60%	52%	8%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		51%				
07	2018	60%	51%	9%	51%	9%
	2017	62%	50%	12%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
	2017	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
09	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
10	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	53%	52%	1%	52%	1%
	2017	42%	49%	-7%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		53%				
07	2018	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
	2017	76%	58%	18%	53%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2018	52%	48%	4%	45%	7%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	26%	46%	-20%	46%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	61%	49%	12%	50%	11%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		61%				

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	79%	76%	3%	71%	8%
2017	75%	72%	3%	69%	6%
Compare	4%				

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	90%	64%	26%	62%	28%
2017	87%	62%	25%	60%	27%
Compare	3%				

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	62%	38%	56%	44%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	100%	60%	40%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

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	29	44	40	40	54	45	49	54	65		
ELL	32	52	35	46	60	50					
ASN	71	38		92	67						
BLK	48	60	62	46	47	20	38	44			
HSP	45	45	53	49	58	59	60	83	100		
MUL	68	73	73	76	73	63	43	93			
WHT	65	57	50	73	65	58	69	84	83		
FRL	52	49	47	59	59	55	59	75	75		
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	25	42	39	32	42	35	26	49	90		
ELL	42	54	36	53	54	31					
ASN	91	73		100	64						
BLK	31	42	55	39	36	18					
HSP	54	56	38	59	60	50	46	63	90		
MUL	49	51	36	60	51	44	58	70	92		
WHT	68	67	61	67	57	50	53	82	77		
FRL	52	58	52	51	46	37	45	73	67		

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	
Title	Reading Proficiency in All Subgroup Areas
Rationale	Scores for our subgroups in ELA were Surfside's lowest achievement scores. A more intentional focus on our economically disadvantaged, disabled, and ELL students will translate into improved proficiency rates for these students.
Intended Outcome	It is our intention that Proficiency Levels and/or Learning Gains will occur in each of these subgroup areas, with improvement of at least 5%.
Point Person	Sue Harrell (harresb@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1."Focus on Five" Initiative: Each teacher will select 5 students from his or her subgroup areas and provide support for these students in particular. A Google document will be provided so that we do not duplicate students insofar as is possible. Teachers will review ELL Strategies for the classroom through a workshop presented by District Resource Teacher, September 2018 PLC Day) 2.Reading Review: In PLC's and faculty meetings, reading teachers will provide a continuing review of research-based reading strategies to help students improve reading skills. 3.Language Arts Focus on Fiction: Language arts and reading teachers will focus on fictional content, while other disciplines focus on non-fiction content. This will provide experiences with a broader text base.
Person Responsible	Sue Harrell (harresb@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Focus on Five Initiative: Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor the Google Doc for teacher comments and frequency of contact to ensure that each group is being appropriately served on a regular basis. Achievement scores in MAP, nine (9) weeks grades, and FSA, will improve for at least 25% of these students. 2. Reading Review: PLC minutes and PLC meeting agendas will provide documentation of this strategy. Principal and assistants will monitor PLCs for fidelity. FSA results in ELA learning gains will improve for the lower quartile in ELA by at least 5% for 2018-19, as compared to 2017-18 scores of 53%. 3. Focus on Fiction: Administrators will monitor teacher lesson plans and conduct classroom walk-throughs, as well as monitor PLCs, to ensure that teachers provide more opportunities for students to interact with fiction in language arts classrooms. 2018019 FSA ELA Scores will reflect an improvement in lower quartile learning gains of at least 5% over the 2017-18 school score which was at 53%.
Person Responsible	Sue Harrell (harresb@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Improved Student Behavior Through Relationship-building
Rationale	If the number of students who have one or more suspensions can be reduced, academic achievement should improve, since these students miss direct instruction while on suspension. Research indicates that "time on task" and "academic seat time" are factors in learning, while strong teacher mentoring is a factor in motivating students to improve both behavior and academic performance.
Intended Outcome	It is our intention that the number of students who have one or more suspensions will be reduced by at least 5% in each subgroup area.
Point Person	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1. "Focus on Five" Initiative: Each teacher will select 5 students from his or her subgroup areas and provide support for these students in particular. A Google document will be provided so that we do not duplicate students insofar as is possible. (Teachers will review ELL Strategies for the classroom through a workshop presented by District Resource Teacher, September 2018 PLC Day) As a result of this focus, the annual spring Climate Survey student results will show improvement in 2 items. The % of students who describe teachers as "unfair" will decrease from 22% in 2017-18 to 20% or less, while the % of students who describe interactions with adults at school as "supportive" will increase from 46% to 50% or more. 2. Staff Mentoring: Using the Google Doc of students chosen by teachers for their focus, staff members will ensure that students who are assigned a suspension are matched up with a staff mentor to encourage them to improve behavior and focus on academics. Recognition and rewards will be provided for these students as they make improvements. 3. Focus on Character Initiative: Josten's Character Education curriculum will be used school-wide on Mondays in our REEF (remediation/enrichment period) to help build strong character traits. Teachers will focus on relationship-building with students who have behavior issues, which will be reflected in the annual school climate survey. The 2018-19 Climate Survey student results will improve in "how students feel at school," as evidenced by the % of students describing themselves as "happy" will increase from 36% in 2017-18 to 40% or more.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Focus on Five Initiative: Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor the Google Doc for teacher comments and frequency of contact to ensure that each group is being appropriately served on a regular basis. 2. Staff Mentoring: School administrators will monitor students who receive suspensions and assign them to staff mentors for encouragement, recognition, and rewards. Data from 2018-19 will be compared to data from 2017-18 to determine if improvement occurred, as measured by the number of students who receive one or more suspensions. The number of suspensions will be reduced 5% from 159 in 2017-18. 3. Focus on Character Initiative: Administration will monitor lesson plans and conduct walk-throughs to ensure that this is occurring with fidelity. Assistant Administrator will provide curriculum materials, including links to the Josten's videos.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

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.

The school has a very active School Advisory Council and has been recognized as a Five Star School for 18 years consecutively. Our SAC participated in writing the current mission and vision statements for our school and reviews data, goals and strategies for the school improvement plan before it is finalized. We hold several parent coffees across the year, two open house times, summer open campus days, and utilize parent volunteers in a myriad of ways. Volunteer hours reached over 30,000 last school year (parent/student/teacher).
To provide as much information to parents as possible, the school uses the district Parent Portal system, e-mail, newsletters, and our web page. We also utilize an IRIS alerts, our electronic message board, and parent conferences. Individual teachers utilize other technology applications to keep parents involved in the instructional program, including Remind 101, Edmoto, and website favorites. All of these initiatives encourage parent participation among all our student subgroups.

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.

Students' social-emotional needs are met in a variety of ways at Surfside. Not only do we provide counseling services, but we also welcome mentoring from community members and staff for at-risk students. Students also participate in numerous activities which provide avenues for social-emotional growth and well-being, including teams and clubs. A military counselor is provided through Navy resources, and a JS2S (Junior Student to Student) club for student ambassadors welcomes and supports our military students as well as other students affected by mobility issues.

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

Several activities facilitate the transition from elementary school to middle school and from middle school to high school. These include end of the year visits to high schools for 8th graders and incoming 6th grade visits in the spring from area feeder schools. A spring open house for parents and rising 6th graders provides an opportunity for this as well. High school counselors are invited to visit 8th grade classrooms and assist students with registration, as do high school coaches. The collegiate program directors from each high school visit with their student teams in spring for mini-seminars for 8th graders as well. Open campus is held through the month of July for rising 6th graders and parents to visit campus and familiarize themselves with our school, and our JS2S provides a welcoming climate for transfer students in need of transition services.

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.

Members of the SILT (School Improvement Leadership Team) meet monthly, including during the summer, to plan and organize a variety of areas for our school. They present school inservice, participate in interviews, organize and participate in curricular teams, and provide leadership for our Professional Learning Communities, as well as our grade level teams. SILT members serve on special committees, i.e., MTSS, Social, Positive Behavior Support, etc., and coordinate service projects throughout the year. They are a highly collaborative group who mentor new teachers and support all aspects of school life. Teachers share in the budgeting process and help establish priority needs for students, with all funding dispersed and used in accordance with local, state and federal guidelines.

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

n/a

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$0.00**