Desoto Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

http://dms.desotoschools.com/

Demographics

Principal: David Boland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	CS&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 Desoto 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.

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

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

http://dms.desotoschools.com/

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	58%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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 mission of DeSoto Middle School is to provide all students a positive learning environment focused on building relationships, high levels of student engagement and setting high expectations with academic rigor.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of DeSoto Middle School is to provide a positive school culture that is student focused, promoting the development of the whole child and inspiring lifelong learners.

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
Derpich, Michelle	Principal	Scheduling Budget, Fundraising, Money Observation Schedule Staff Faculty/ Dept. Chair Meetings Data Curriculum Instructional Material SAC ScIP Front Office - Marty, Bev, Jamie, Bookkeepers Expulsion Hearings Hiring/ Recruiting 8th Grade Promotion Guidance & ESE English & Math ESOL / Migrant Technology Extra Curricular Events Intensive Reading Field Trips New Staff Meetings Principal's Council Attendance at Events/ Sports
Nelson, Leslie	Assistant Principal	8th Grade Discipline Students Deans Duties AM/ PM Arrival & Dismissal ISS School Safety Attendance/ Attendance Meetings Nola MTSS AVID 21st Century PE Expos Science Attendance at Events/ Sports Bulldog Pride Committee (Student/ Teacher of the Month) Backpack Program Website Facebook 6th Grade Orientation Nurse Copy Machine Codes At-Risk Meetings w/ Ms. Warren

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	346	319	366	0	0	0	0	1031
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	40	57	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	15	0	0	0	0	37
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	84	95	138	0	0	0	0	317

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
Thursday 10/10/2019

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	73	53	59	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	86	87	0	0	0	0	281
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	182	188	0	0	0	0	532

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	86	84	80	0	0	0	0	250

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	73	53	59	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	86	87	0	0	0	0	281
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	182	188	0	0	0	0	532

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	86	84	80	0	0	0	0	250

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	35%	35%	54%	31%	31%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	54%	46%	46%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	40%	47%	38%	38%	44%
Math Achievement	36%	36%	58%	34%	34%	56%
Math Learning Gains	38%	38%	57%	59%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	32%	51%	55%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	30%	30%	51%	22%	22%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	46%	46%	72%	50%	50%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	346 (0)	319 (0)	366 (0)	1031 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (73)	40 (53)	57 (59)	130 (185)
One or more suspensions	15 (108)	7 (86)	15 (87)	37 (281)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (10)	0 (9)	0 (1)	0 (20)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	84 (162)	95 (182)	138 (188)	317 (532)

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	33%	32%	1%	54%	-21%
	2018	33%	33%	0%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	29%	0%	52%	-23%
	2018	34%	34%	0%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	40%	40%	0%	56%	-16%
	2018	37%	37%	0%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	36%	1%	55%	-18%
	2018	36%	35%	1%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	33%	1%	54%	-20%
	2018	36%	36%	0%	54%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	9%	8%	1%	46%	-37%
	2018	17%	17%	0%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	29%	1%	48%	-18%
	2018	28%	28%	0%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	43%	1%	71%	-27%
2018	46%	46%	0%	71%	-25%
Compare		-2%			

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	87%	40%	47%	61%	26%
2018	79%	44%	35%	62%	17%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	39%	-39%	57%	-57%
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	16	40	31	17	30	28	17	35			
ELL	15	40	38	26	37	39	18	23	69		
BLK	26	41	39	21	29	27	15	41			
HSP	32	46	44	36	39	34	30	41	82		
MUL	32	56		15	21						
WHT	40	46	34	41	41	30	33	53	81		
FRL	29	45	40	31	35	29	24	43	76		

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	17	38	37	17	45	45	13	31			

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
ELL	5	38	51	14	36	45	4	18			
BLK	13	41	40	13	35	38	9	28			
HSP	35	48	53	38	50	53	29	46	80		
MUL	38	65		21	52		25				
WHT	43	54	51	42	56	55	36	53	72		
FRL	31	48	49	33	48	50	25	43	73		

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	7	36	32	12	50	44	6	22			
ELL	13	37	45	16	51	56		29			
BLK	16	34	26	17	51	49	19	26			
HSP	29	45	37	36	58	52	19	49	70		
MUL	32	35		33	59			58			
WHT	36	51	44	36	63	61	26	58	67		
FRL	26	44	41	29	56	53	17	47	64		

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	12
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	32

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	31
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Overall math achievement showed the lowest performance; specifically 8th grade math. I believe the contributing factor was the lack of certified math teachers and inconsistencies with substitutes.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. I believe the contributing factor was the lack of certified math teachers and inconsistencies with substitutes. Also, there was not co-teaching/ inclusion model followed in math for SWD.

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.

Social Studies Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. I believe that our struggling readers find reading informational text difficult to comprehend and analyze.

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

The only area of improvement was Science Achievement from 29% to 30%. I do not think this was a significant increase, however Science Benchmarks were given throughout the year in 7 and 8th grade to progress monitor and drive instruction.

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

The amount of students with attendance below 90% and the amount of students suspended is alarming. Students need to be in class to learn and grow. Also, there seems to be no correlation between students grades and proficiency on state assessments, which makes me question the alignment of lessons and school-wide assessments to standards.

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

1. Proficiency Levels of Students with Disabilities in ELA and Math
2. Proficiency Levels of Black/ African American Students in ELA and Math
3. Proficiency Levels of English Language Learners in ELA and Math
4. Overall ELA Achievement
5. Overall Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Our needs assessment and data showed that students are performing below the state average and decreased since 2018.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve ELA scores on FSA to 40% proficiency and 2.5% in learning gains SWD 32%, African American 32% and Multiracial 32%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Develop and maintain systems to assess and track student mastery of standards using STAR Assessments five times a year. Data chats and collaborative planning will be conducted during teacher planning time to assess student mastery and areas to reteach. All students past FSA scores will be identified, ESSA groups and BQ students to target instruction based on individual student needs. Teachers will also set individual goals with each student and conduct data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Scores, FSA Scores, School Data Comparisons

Action Step

Description	1. Review student data throughout the year using STAR Assessments 2. Maintain data binders for students 3. Common Planning 4. Employ a certified teacher in 85% of the ELA classes 5. Provide an ESE Teacher for SWD students in a least restrictive environment
Person Responsible	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Our needs assessment and data showed that students are performing below the state average and decreased since 2018.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve Math proficiency scores on FSA to 40% proficiency and 2.5% in learning gains SWD 32%, African American 32% and Multiracial 32%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Develop and maintain systems to assess and track student mastery of standards using STAR Assessments five times a year. All students past FSA scores will be identified, ESSA groups and BQ students to target instruction based on individual student needs.Data chats and collaborative planning will be conducted during teacher planning time to assess student mastery and areas to reteach. Teachers will also set individual goals with each student and conduct data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Scores, FSA Scores, School Data Comparisons

Action Step	
Description	1. Review student data throughout the year using STAR Assessments 2. Maintain data binders for students 3. Common Planning 4. Employ a certified teacher in 85% of the Math classes 5. Provide an ESE Teacher for SWD students in a least restrictive environment
Person Responsible	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

#3	
Title	SWD Proficiency
Rationale	Our data shows for two consecutive years this subgroup has been below the minimum of 32%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans on increasing SWD's proficiency to at least 32% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The school will use an inclusive educational practice that will be monitored to support students in the least restrictive academic environment. Professional development will be provided for staff on inclusive practices for all school personnel. All staff will have access to ESE Teachers and/ or the ESE Staffing Specialist, including core teachers, Expo staff and other members for support. The ESE Director, Principal, Assistant Principal and ESE Staffing Specialist will conduct walk throughs to promote discussion with staff members and provide staff with feedback and support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	After the previous administration completed the School Level Self Assessment from BPIE the school priority indicators above were selected to focus on for the 2019-2020 school year.

Action Step

Description	1. Ensure an ESE Teacher is providing inclusion support in Math and ELA classes. 2. The ESE Staffing Specialist will work to monitor goals and short and long term inclusive educational practices per student with the team and administration will evaluate the program and teachers. 3. Time will be provided for general education staff to meet with ESE Staff. 4. Professional Development will be provided for all staff.
Person Responsible	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

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).

Create a positive school climate and culture with high expectations. (1) Set school wide non-negotiables with stakeholders for staff, students and parents. (2) Set school-wide expectations for staff and student attendance and behavior (3) Create opportunities for students and staff to lead and obtain their input (4) Provide positive incentives and recognition programs by establishing the Bulldog Pride Committee for student and staff attendance and behavior.
-Alternatives to suspensions will be offered to students and families (BOE approved)
-Student and staff attendance will be shared bi-weekly and letters will be sent home quarterly for students with 100% attendance
-A breakfast will be held at the end of the year for all students with 100% attendance
-Attendance meetings will be held if students have more than 5 unexcused absences in a quarter or more than 10 absences
-Students without In-School and Out of School Suspension will be able to participate in quarterly reward programs

-Attendance and Behavior will be reviewed previous to students attending field trips
-Monthly rewards will be given to students and staff caught being good/ going above and beyond on campus

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, § 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 will maintain and update social media venues of updates at DeSoto Middle School. An event will be held for students and parents at night to promote awareness about bullying during Semester I. Another presentation will be provided Semester 2 based on school need. Remind 101 will be utilized to communicate with families and positive articles will be published via The Arcadian about the school to share with the community.

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.

Instructional coaches, guidance counselors, and staffing specialists from feeder elementary schools meet with DMS staff to review data and records of incoming students to identify those needing additional supplemental instruction and those requiring advanced coursework. Open House is held before school starts to meet staff, see classrooms, ask questions, etc.

The same procedure is utilized with outgoing 8th graders. In addition to these steps, many 8th graders participate in advanced coursework and are enrolled in high school courses for credit at DMS.

Check and Connect is provided for students that are identified as ESE and need extra assistance.

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

School Based Leadership Team:
Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, progress monitoring, intervention support, and documentation. In addition the Team ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and plans while communicating with parent and school advisory regarding the school-based Literacy plans and activities.

Instructional Coaches:
Develops, leads, coordinates and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students considered "at risk;" assists in the design and

implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation.

Coordination of Supplemental Funds, Services and Programs
Title I, Part A
Services are provided to students in need of additional services through after school programs, summer institutes, and intervention instruction during the school day. The district coordinates the use of Title I, II, and III funds to provide professional development for teachers and administrators to improve instructional practices and support improvement in student achievement.

Title I, Part C- Migrant
Migrant Advocates at each school site provide instructional support to students either during or after the student academic day. These advocates coordinate services with Title I and other programs.

Title I, Part D
Funds from this source are used to support instruction in DJJ facilities located in DeSoto, and to develop and implement a drop out prevention program for the district.

Title III
Services are provided at each school site to support education of English Language Learners for the purpose of improving student performance.

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.

DeSoto Middle School is an AVID school. Our students are encouraged to research their career goals and the work needed to achieve those goals. Our AVID students visit colleges as well.

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

The school promotes college and career awareness through AVID, providing opportunities for students to visit colleges, offering virtual field trips to schools out of state and implementing College & Career Mondays starting Semester II.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: SWD Proficiency**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**