

Martin County School District

Dr. David L. Anderson 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

Demographics**Principal: Ebony Jarrett**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2019

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)	64%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Martin 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

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	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Be Equitable. Be Courageous. Be Proud.

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL students high school ready without the need of remediation

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
Aitken, Tim	Principal	School Leader
Davis, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Flanagan, Joe	Assistant Principal	
Hyde, Dino	Teacher, K-12	
Kemler, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Lavere, Gina	Teacher, K-12	
McMurry, Diane	Instructional Coach	
Milton, Vicki	Assistant Principal	
Piasecki, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Register, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Sigmon, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Webster, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	

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	354	359	391	0	0	0	0	1104	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	16	0	0	0	0	41	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	79	120	0	0	0	0	307	

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	9	10	9	0	0	0	0	28	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	3	0	0	0	22	

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

73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/3/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Students with two or more indicators															

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	11	21	22	0	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	43	35	0	0	0	0	100	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	101	90	0	0	0	0	258	

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	10	24	24	0	0	0	0	58	

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	52%	62%	54%	49%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	54%	51%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	68%	74%	58%	74%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	68%	57%	81%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	55%	51%	74%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	64%	64%	51%	51%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	87%	72%	60%	75%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	354 (0)	359 (0)	391 (0)	1104 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ()	11 ()	16 ()	41 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	108 (0)	79 (0)	120 (0)	307 (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	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	56%	62%	-6%	56%	0%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	64%	-3%	55%	6%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	65%	67%	-2%	46%	19%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	45%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	77%	-34%	71%	-28%
2018	81%	79%	2%	71%	10%
Compare		-38%			

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	93%	75%	18%	61%	32%
2018	96%	70%	26%	62%	34%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	23	47	46	44	64	65	29				
ELL	19	46	52	39	51	49	26		59		
ASN	89	90		100	65				100		
BLK	36	40	33	53	48	56	38				
HSP	39	49	51	58	59	57	53		70		
MUL	44	49		61	49	30	50		70		
WHT	63	57	49	77	65	55	74		79		
FRL	40	48	46	60	58	55	53		70		
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	25	45	45	34	55	51	27	52			
ELL	21	49	46	51	59	51	24	65	57		
ASN	78	74		100	87				100		
BLK	36	64	55	53	67	74	48	70	42		
HSP	37	50	46	60	61	49	45	77	59		
MUL	56	50	27	74	72		69	73	36		
WHT	59	59	56	78	71	57	75	87	67		
FRL	40	52	49	62	64	53	52	76	51		

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	15	33	27	36	60	58	21	16	50		
ELL	19	40	34	52	74	66	20	28	23		
ASN	87	83		100	79			90	90		
BLK	29	39	32	59	77	63	30	62			
HSP	36	47	40	63	74	67	34	41	43		
MUL	50	44	55	82	91		62	55			
WHT	59	55	44	82	85	87	63	74	65		
FRL	36	45	40	65	77	70	38	45	42		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
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	65
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	56
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.

ELA. ELA has been our lowest contributing factor as long as I have been at the school. We have had new teachers in ELA every year. There is a teacher shortage in the state of Florida because Florida is the 46th out of 48 continental states in terms of teacher pay. Teachers are leaving the profession at the highest rate ever. Additionally, we are governed by people who know absolutely nothing about education. State and federal mandates are comical efforts toward reform and do nothing but add to the pressures put on teachers. Our standards approach and heavy measures of student accountability have eliminated a love of reading so kids are reading at the lowest levels ever. If kids are not reading and cannot access text at their grade-level complexity, then it does not matter how well our teachers know their standards.

Nonetheless we have to teach better, in spite of our struggles, and be creative in our program planning.

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

Civics. Our district moved Civics to 8th grade last year leaving us to test only about 25 students, 10 of which counted and seven passed. I decided to only test those that needed to be tested and take the performance hit this year rather than next year.

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.

Math ELL. We need to teach English language learners better. This is an anomaly in our data. Our gap data has been better in years past, especially in math.

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

6th grade ELA. AL went up 22%; LG went up 7%; BQLG went up 18% from the previous year. We are confident that our ELA teachers know their standards, but we were not improving performance. We theorized that regardless of how well our teachers knew their standards, if the students could not access the text at the grade level complexity, performance would not improve. We moved away from a focus on ELA standards and made the main thing the main thing - develop a love of reading. We cannot leave the ability to read to chance any longer. We needed to design a classroom instructional sequence that allowed students time to read silently and teachers conference daily. We ignored lexile levels and simply allowed students to make interested-based book choices. Teachers learned how to conference with students to monitor their progress, understanding, and perspectives.

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

7th grade continues to be our lowest performing group. Academic struggles persist as do our behavior issues.

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

1. ELA Instructional practices
2. ELL instruction and support design

3. ESE instructional support design
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title ELA Instructional Design

Rationale We are confident that our ELA teachers know their standards, but we were not improving performance. We theorized that regardless of how well our teachers knew their standards, if the students could not access the text at the grade level complexity, performance would not improve. We moved away from a focus on ELA standards and made the main thing the main thing - develop a love of reading. We cannot leave the ability to read to chance any longer. We needed to design a classroom instructional sequence that allowed students time to read silently and teachers conference daily. We ignored lexile levels and simply allowed students to make interested-based book choices. Teachers learned how to conference with students to monitor their progress, understanding, and perspectives.

State the

measurable outcome the school plans to achieve We believe with this plan we can increase student performance in ELA AL, LG, and BQLG all by 10% this year. Additionally, not that this data is relevant to the state but it is a good indicator of our real goal (which is to return the love of reading to students) that we believe we can double our number coming out of our circulation desk on campus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Independent reading time with conferencing (Coupling Theory)
a) Woulfin, S. L. (2015). Highway to reform: The coupling of district reading policy and instructional practice. Journal of Educational Change, 16(4), 535-557. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10833-015-9261-5

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

We cannot continue to leave reading to chance. The ability to read is directly influenced by the opportunities taken to read and conference at younger ages. We cannot continue to leave those opportunities to chance any longer. We needed to design a classroom instructional sequence that guarantees students time to read silently in class and teachers conference time daily. This allows us to make sure that when students do read, they are rewarded with an intellectual conversation about their text, not burdened with tasks, but one-on-one time with their teacher.

Action Step

Description

1. Model these behaviors for teachers
2. Work with the willing
3. Demonstrate effectiveness
4. Support implementation by creating demonstration classrooms for teacher visits
5. Provide feedback to the teachers to support their implementation and progress

Person Responsible

Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

#2	
Title	P.E.E.R Instruction: Deepening Understanding
Rationale	Our onsite research has outlined one of our strengths is having students practice concepts, techniques, and strategies. Rarely do we have students examine their work with someone else's work, examine their own reasoning relative to someone else's, and then genuinely revised knowledge.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	PEER is an instructional framework whereas teachers cyclically rotate through four stages of learning application: Practice what has been taught; Examine Similarities and Differences; Examine Reasoning; Revise Knowledge. This process takes what teachers are already great at doing (having students practice that which they have learned) and then taking the experience further. Students will share with each other their process (in any content area) where they will highlight any differences (right or wrong). They will then discuss what they did and why they did it. This sharing of reasoning is critical because it is my hypothesis that the difference between a "smart student" and one who struggles in school is the ability to quickly reason. Therefore, if we provide students who historically struggle with the same reasoning skills and processes as our most skilled students, than all students have a chance at being historically successful. Embedded in this process of sharing reasoning is the epiphanies of understanding, the identification of errors, and the visual and conversational support of what the process looked like when done correctly. The byproduct of this process will demonstrate that there are many ways to do our work, that one specific way may be faster, but not more correct.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	P.E.E.R is a personalized plan taken from larger research supported by Hattie and Marzano
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our onsite research has outlined one of our strengths is having students practice concepts, techniques, and strategies. Rarely do we have students examine their work with someone else's work, examine their own reasoning relative to someone else's, and then genuinely revised knowledge. Therefore, because much of this process is usually left to chance, it is only ever captured by the most skilled students in the room. By making this available to all students, equity reigns and every student is afforded the opportunities usually withheld for "elite" learners.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roll out the idea of P.E.E.R. 2. Work with the willing 3. Model the behaviors 4. Create a demonstration classroom for other teachers to visit 5. Monitor effectiveness through pulse-checks
Person Responsible	Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.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).

I believe P.E.E.R attends to all student needs and therefore can influence the performance of ELL and ESE students.

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.

The school has an active Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) that incorporates members of the community and local businesses that help support the school. Events include participation in Family Nights and Open House. The School Advisory Council (SAC) is comprised of local business member and parents/community members and staff who work together to allocate the school improvements funds to support student needs.

Increase Communication:

- + Add messages to the message boards at Parent-Pickup Loop
- + Add message through social media (Facebook) and Remind.
- + Use a parent mini-resource center/parent liason at school to help ELL parents
- + Continually increase community partnerships with local business
- + Community forum held once a month to parent consisting of various topics offered in both English and Spanish
- + Changing PTA meeting days and hours to accommodate more member.

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.

AMS has three full-time school counselors and a part-time social worker who provide services which are supported by district personnel and outside agencies. Additionally, Helping People Succeed, Tykes & Teens, and Treasure Coast Hospice assist with individual and small group counseling services. Currently, there are five Americorps members at AMS everyday who check in on our students by building relationships and mentoring them. Lastly, we offer food and clothing to families in need of assistance.

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

AMS implements several strategies to support our incoming and outgoing cohorts in transition from one level to another in order to assist our rising 5th graders transition from elementary to middle school. The Principal, a school counselor, and three students (one from each grade level) arrange an assembly for our feeder schools. The assembly orients our rising 5th graders with what to expect during their upcoming transition. Our current students present their experiences at AMS and how they each adjusted to the transition. Our school-wide expectations, dress-code policy, scheduling, elective choices, sports, and clubs are explained in detail. The 5th graders are provided with an opportunity to ask any questions they have and their questions are addressed. These assemblies are given prior to our 6th grade

orientation which provides an excellent venue to promote the value in attending.

At 6th grade orientation, incoming 6th grade students and parents are invited to come to AMS. The orientation provides the families and students with valuable information to assist with the transition from elementary to middle school. All of our sports, clubs, and extracurricular activities are showcased. Families are given the opportunity to sign their child up for any area that they are interested in. Our band, chorus, twirlers, and cheerleaders perform for the families as well.

Our incoming 6th grade students are provided with a "pre-school" day, the day prior to their regular start date. This "pre-school" day is solely for the new 6th grade students without the presence of the 7th and 8th grade students. This day allows them to get their schedule, meet their teachers, and familiarize themselves with the campus.

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 Guiding Coalition which is our leadership team identifies and aligns available resources in order to meet the needs of all student. Our SAC committee also has input as to these decisions .Through reports from the Principal and the school bookkeeper funds are reported as to the availability. The members of the team, or non member , may bring up a need and the team discusses the need and if it if in line with our vision , mission and school improvement goals. The Principal is the key person responsible. The team meets bi-weekly. Various protocol are used depending on the need of the request. All information is reported back to all other stake holders to get their input. Team leaders then report back to the Guiding Coalition.

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

AMS provides students with college and career awareness through our current academic electives; our computer electives introduce them to possibilities in the field of Information Technology and Digital Design. AMS offers a medical elective which familiarizes students with the employment opportunities within the field of health sciences. Students who take either of these courses (Information to Technology/ Medical) in 8th grade grade earn high school credit (s).

AMS offers AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination), AVID is an elective which is designed to academically support students in middle school. The program, provides a structure for planning a college and/ or career path after high school. Students are given the opportunity to create a 6 year plan in which guides them when confronted with decision about what to do post-secondarily. Students are given the opportunity to hear from guest speakers from the community about various career fields. Lastly, AVID students are given the opportunity to tour colleges and universities providing them with direct exposure to the various campuses and the areas of study they offer.

Yellow Brick Road is a success-skills oriented program for selected 8th grade students. Selected student participate in four workshops throughout the year. The workshops focus on college and career readiness. Students are given the opportunity to tour two college campuses.

All 8th grade students are provided with a career and education planning course. This course provides students with the opportunity to explore the various career options that they might be interested in.

Through this curriculum the students develop the knowledge and skills required to evaluate various careers. Additionally, our students research is showcased in career fair format, students create a presentation of the knowledge gained from their research and present it to an audience which consists of other students, faculty, staff and community members.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Instructional Design	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: P.E.E.R Instruction: Deepening Understanding	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00