

Duval County Public Schools

Jean Ribault Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUT SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/rms>

Demographics

Principal: Ronnie Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUT SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/rms>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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 provide exceptional educational opportunities for every student, everyday.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students are motivated to capitalize on every learning opportunity that will prepare them for high school and beyond.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Ronnie	Principal	
	School Counselor	
Burroughs, Lakeisha	Instructional Coach	
Moses, Lisa	Instructional Coach	
Hall, Mishel'le	Dean	
Brown, Latoya	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/5/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	43%	54%	20%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	49%	54%	41%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	47%	41%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	39%	49%	58%	34%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	45%	50%	57%	48%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	47%	51%	52%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	15%	44%	51%	16%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	68%	72%	55%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	24%	47%	-23%	54%	-30%
	2018	21%	44%	-23%	52%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	20%	44%	-24%	52%	-32%
	2018	16%	41%	-25%	51%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	23%	49%	-26%	56%	-33%
	2018	21%	51%	-30%	58%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
	2018	32%	42%	-10%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	47%	-19%	54%	-26%
	2018	20%	50%	-30%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	30%	32%	-2%	46%	-16%
	2018	17%	31%	-14%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	13%	40%	-27%	48%	-35%
	2018	2%	44%	-42%	50%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	23%	63%	-40%	65%	-42%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	69%	-8%	71%	-10%
2018	35%	84%	-49%	71%	-36%
Compare		26%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	57%	6%	61%	2%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Compare		-19%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	61%	28%	57%	32%
2018					

Subgroup Data

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	29	32	30	42	50	41	19	63			
BLK	25	36	30	38	45	43	12	65	71		
MUL	69	46		50	53						
WHT	52	59		52	43						
FRL	25	36	31	37	44	40	11	65	79		
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	38	50	42	40	49	46	54	55			
BLK	23	35	37	34	42	44	17	41	56		
MUL	42	50		53	50						
WHT	41	44		53	50						
FRL	25	36	39	34	42	46	18	43	62		
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	6	36	32	13	35	45	11	28			
BLK	19	40	41	34	48	52	15	53	56		
MUL	47	41		31	44						
WHT	27			43	40						
FRL	19	38	42	32	48	51	15	53	59		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
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%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that performed the lowest was 8th grade Science, 15% proficiency. The consistent monitoring of student performance

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our lowest performing quartile in reading showed a 6% decline from the previous year. The factors that contributed to this decline was the consistent monitoring of this population of students and re-teaching/re-assessing of previously taught standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Reading. Reading has historically been an area of improvement for JRMS. However, as you dive deeper into data, it appears that there are a number of students that have been proficient or showed gains previously, but declined. Then, there are current students that must remain proficient. We are

utilizing a reading intervention program called SRA. This program will help our students become better readers and be able to comprehend what they are reading.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Civics showed a 24% increase from the previous school year. One action we took was to follow the master scheduling guidelines as instructed. Therefore, we placed our proficient 7th grade students in Civics. In addition, our Level 1's and 2's in 7th grade were placed into Law Studies as a means of providing them an additional year of exposing them to Civics standards before taking the EOC.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

n/a

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Reading proficiency
2. Reading gains
3. BQ reading gains
4. BQ math gains
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	The overall proficiency is 26%. While we did show improvement (+2% points), we want to continue improving student's ability to become better readers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to increase proficiency to 35%; 50% learning gains; lowest performing quartile 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Implement a systematic way of ensuring that teachers are better aligning instruction to standards -Use a teacher tiered system of instructional support. -Utilize SRA Corrective Reading program with fidelity and monitor student progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting these strategies is to help teachers become better standards-based planners of instruction. In addition, it will help teachers access more information that is aligned to the standard. Also, students need phonemic awareness and reading comprehension skills.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a standards based template that ensures aligned instructional delivery and assessment. 2. Perform classroom walk-throughs to identify strengths and weaknesses of instructional staff and provide targeted support based on observations. 3. Utilize Reading Coach to provide tiered instructional support and targeted professional development for ELA/Reading and Elective teachers. 4. Implement SRA Correction reading intervention program with fidelity and monitor student progress.
Person Responsible	Lisa Moses (mosesl1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	The overall proficiency is currently at 39%. This illustrates an increase in math by 4%. Also, acceleration percentage was 72%. This is a 15% from the 17-18 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to increase proficiency to 46%; gains 55%; and lowest performing quartile 52%. Our acceleration goal is 90%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize 4 Column method FCIM lesson and focus calendar ACALETICS Math 180
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were selected because it allows students to think critically about math problems they are solving; the use of an focus calendar and FCIM allows teachers to re-visit standards previously taught to determine student level of mastery and reassess; ACALETICS is designed to accelerate and review mathematical concepts towards standards based mastery; Math 180 is designed to provided targeted instruction to level 1 students in math.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize math administrator and coach to provide tiered coaching and targeted professional development for math teachers. 2. Math teachers will review data to identify students who did not perform well on specific standards for the purpose of implementing small group and differentiated instruction using the instructional framework and resources. 3. All core math and Algebra 1 classes will devote 15 minutes to ACALETICS each day 4. All level 1 math students will be scheduled to take an Intensive Math course (Math 180) 5.
Person Responsible	Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Based on 18-19 FSA results, the overall proficiency was 15%. This illustrates an increase of 13%, not including Biology data from the 17-18 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal for 19-20 school year is 35%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	LENSES strategy Incorporate reading strategies (cube, annotating the text) FCIM lesson and focus calendar ACALETICS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The LENSES strategy will allow students to break down information and organize it in a manner suitable for learning; incorporate reading strategies that will allow student to become better readers and improve comprehension skills; the use of an focus calendar and FCIM allows teachers to re-visit standards previously taught to determine student level of mastery and reassess; ACALETICS is designed to accelerate and review mathematical concepts towards standards based mastery
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate reading strategies, such as LENSES, to help students comprehend informational text. 2. Utilize additional teacher support in Science to conduct push ins and pull outs of targeted students and previously taught standards. 3. Implement 8th grade Science ACALETICS with fidelity to accelerate student learning of previously taught content 4. Develop FCIM lessons for focus calendar of previously taught standards and re-assess student understanding 5. Conduct monthly data chats with teachers and students
Person Responsible	Latoya Brown (brownl7@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	Civics Achievement
Rationale	The overall proficiency is currently at 66%. This illustrates an increase in Civics from 2017-2018 of 24%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal for the 2019-2020 school year is 76%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	LENSES strategy Incorporate reading strategies (cube, annotating the text) FCIM lesson and focus calendar
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The LENSES strategy will allow students to break down information and organize it in a manner suitable for learning; incorporate reading strategies that will allow student to become better readers and improve comprehension skills; the use of an focus calendar and FCIM allows teachers to re-visit standards previously taught to determine student level of mastery and reassess
Action Step	
Description	1. Incorporate reading strategies, such as LENSES, to help students comprehend informational text. 2. Develop FCIM lessons for focus calendar of previously taught standards and re-assess student understanding 3. Conduct monthly data chats with teachers and students
Person Responsible	Latoya Brown (brownl7@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

We will increase parent involvement activities by 50% by offering monthly parent events during varying times in order to attract all parents.

We will solicit feedback from parents regarding activities they would be interested in happening at JRMS.

We will offer interactive tutorials to parents who are unfamiliar with Gradeportal, teacher and school websites.

We will communicate classroom and school news to parents via JRMS website, parent link, Robcalls and flyers.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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 addressed through various measures aimed at providing counseling, mentoring and services that ensure student success. The office of student services works closely with our school guidance department and to provide students with the necessary requisites for achievement. Guidance counselors are available to meet with students to deal with school related and home issues that may be affecting school performances through one-on-one session and referrals to outside agencies and our new, on site programs, Full Service Plus. Trainings on topics such as conflict prevention and resolution, impulse control, and development of student interpersonal skills.

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

Our school employs school wide AVID strategies to support all students at JRMS.

6th grade students who are considered "at risk" will be recruited by AFL. The course master has also included

7th and 8th grade students to participate in the school based AVID program which entails Cornell Note taking, ACES, LENSES, and organization skills.

8th grade students participate in Parent Night with local High School programs. These programs discuss various academic and extra curricular programs to attract that these students will embark upon as they matriculate into the high school arena.

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.

Tier 1 interventions are designed for every student in the general curriculum. Best practices are aligned with students data to drive instruction and professional development. Teachers use differentiated instruction to increase student understanding. Differentiated professional development is implementing during common planning and early dismissal Wednesday, and them monitored to ensure that the specific outcomes are being implemented in the classroom with students.

The Tier 2 supports include teacher created differentiated instruction based on various student data. The data is organized by the teacher and or the school support staff. Following data analysis, instructional

strategies are created during common planning by content area teachers and school based coaches. Small group instruction is then facilitated by the teacher. Data is monitored to determine the level of success. The Tier 3 supports are individualized and occur throughout the year. Tier 3 individual education is data based using various data sources which include but are not limited to: State assessments data, district assessments, student GPA, discipline data, and attendance data.

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

Establish partnerships with GEAR Up and other businesses to promote college and career awareness.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Civics Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00