Marion County Public Schools

Fort King Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort King Middle School

545 NE 17TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Carter
Start Date for this Principal: 5/21/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (54%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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 is pending approval by the Marion 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

Fort King Middle School

545 NE 17TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

2019-20 Title I School

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

Middle School
6-8

Yes

71%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

Charter School

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

K-12 General Education

No

55%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Ft. King Middle School recognizes that each child is an individual; that all children are creative; that all children need to succeed. Therefore, Ft. King Middle School respects the individual needs of children; fosters a caring and creative environment; and emphasizes the social, emotional, physical, and intellectual development of each child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ft. King Middle School will challenge students of all abilities to achieve excellence in a wide range of academic, cultural, and sporting activities. It will equip students for the demands and opportunities of the twenty-first century by offering a differentiated, effective and rigorous curriculum as an entitlement to all. A professional and highly motivated staff, in partnership with parents, will encourage each student to achieve his/her full potential. In a discipline and caring environment, based on mutual respect, each student will be valued as an individual in his/her own right and his/her moral development encouraged.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smallridge, Gary	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Shepler, Teresa	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Trombly, Chuck	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Jones, Ronald	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Jones, Renee	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Fowler, Dedra	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Harper, Mary	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Singleton, Laura	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need,for the specific area of content.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/21/2015, Michael Carter

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (54%)
	2017-18: B (57%)
	2016-17: C (52%)
	2015-16: D (40%)

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.

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	368	332	357	0	0	0	0	1057
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	85	82	0	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	107	75	0	0	0	0	300
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	38	40	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	30	33	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	118	112	0	0	0	0	342
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	83	92	0	0	0	0	304

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	190	182	170	0	0	0	0	542

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	38	16	20	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/21/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	358	346	353	0	0	0	0	1057
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	62	55	0	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	85	59	0	0	0	0	230
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	71	65	0	0	0	0	213
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	131	133	0	0	0	0	355

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	219	202	237	0	0	0	0	658

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	21	24	18	0	0	0	0	63
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	358	346	353	0	0	0	0	1057
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	62	55	0	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	85	59	0	0	0	0	230
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	71	65	0	0	0	0	213
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	131	133	0	0	0	0	355

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	219	202	237	0	0	0	0	658

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	21	24	18	0	0	0	0	63
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	42%	49%	54%	43%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	54%	50%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	47%	39%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	56%	54%	58%	48%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	58%	57%	59%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	51%	50%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	41%	46%	51%	48%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	70%	72%	68%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	45%	-12%	54%	-21%
	2018	37%	44%	-7%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
	2018	39%	43%	-4%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	46%	-3%	55%	-12%
	2018	44%	42%	2%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	49%	2%	54%	-3%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	55%	41%	14%	46%	9%
	2018	46%	43%	3%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	43%	44%	-1%	48%	-5%
	2018	49%	46%	3%	50%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	62%	65%	-3%	71%	-9%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	63%	64%	-1%	71%	-8%
Compare		-1%			
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	92%	54%	38%	61%	31%
2018	87%	57%	30%	62%	25%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
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	16	45	39	22	46	45	11	33			
ELL	22	59	50	41	47	40	22	36			
ASN	73	64		80	60						
BLK	28	41	37	41	54	62	28	53	71		
HSP	38	54	43	52	57	55	33	59	70		
MUL	46	54	38	55	66	67	50	67	64		
WHT	47	49	41	64	61	54	48	71	78		
FRL	35	46	40	50	57	57	34	58	65		
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	18	40	41	25	57	59	24	31	20		
ELL	22	52	50	30	59	53		56			
ASN	63	47		81	88						
BLK	29	46	49	36	65	68	21	52	61		
HSP	39	60	61	44	62	63	56	58	69		
MUL	44	57	33	61	76		48	65	73		

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
WHT	51	51	42	63	68	69	59	71	73		
FRL	36	49	48	48	65	66	45	58	65		
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	11	29	26	17	46	39	24	36			
ELL	7	33	37	13	49	57		31			
ASN	69	77		77	62						
BLK	24	41	38	26	49	46	22	47			
HSP	41	50	34	41	59	51	46	69	76		
MUL	37	53	47	44	63	50	28	58			
WHT	50	52	40	59	62	53	58	76	55		
FRL	37	44	33	41	56	50	41	63	54		

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	54
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

6th grade ELA data showed the lowest performance with having only 33% in 2019. &th grade had a 40%, while 8th came in at 48%.

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

6th grade ELA showed the greatest decline in proficiency by declining 4% from 37% in 2018 to 33% in 2019. FKMS had a 6th grade ELA teacher out on maternity leave for half the school year. The classroom had a continuous substitute, but that sub was not certified in English.

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.

6th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a 21% difference. 6th grade ELA has historically been the lowest performing area for FKMS, but the school shows gains in proficiency in 7th and again in 8th.

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

8th grade math showed the most improvement by increasing from 46% proficient in 2018 to 55% in 2019. This is a direct result of adding in intensive math classes to the master schedule 3 years ago.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1) 195 students failed ELA or Math (as of 5/21/20)
2) 342 were level 1 in ELA, and 304 level 1 in Math

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

1. Increase the percentage of proficient ELA students in grades 6-8 by 5%, and grade 6 ELA by a minimum of 7%
2. Increase our ELA Learning Gains for the BQ by 10%to reach 50% in 2021
3. Continue our Intensive Math Program of a minimum of 24 sections for grades 6-8 to maintain our math proficiency and LGs. (Title I & District funds)
4. Continue to fund via Title I funds a Content Area Specialist to support our teachers in teaching strategies to engage students and to maximize student achievement.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Curriculum- Continue to offer Intensive Math to all level 1 and 2 students in grades 6-8 and to reduce class sizes in general math classes in grades 6-8. Rationale To maintain the math learning gains and achievement progress made over the past three years, as measured by FSA Math. In addition to maintaining the growth experienced over the past two year, which helped move FKMS to a "B" from a "D" in two years, FKMS will increase the learning gains in math by 5% from 59% to 64% in 2021. The intended outcome is to keep the two additional math teachers on the roster and part of the master schedule for 2020-2021.
Measurable Outcome:	If we continue to fund two additional math teachers with our Title I budget to help reduce class size; add intensive math sections to the Ft. King Middle School master schedule, then the percentage of proficient FSA math scores will increase by 5% from 56% to 61% and the percentage of level one or level two FSA math scores will decrease by 5% to 39% from 44%; and Students with Disabilities scoring proficient on FSA Math will increase by 10% from 22% in 2019 to 32% in 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Adding Intensive Math to a level 1 or level 2 student's schedule allows time for the teacher to teach the non-proficient student from their level to build a strong mathematical foundation, which allows such students to pass their regular math class and rise to a proficient score on FSA. If Intensive Math is offered over a three-year period during the middle school years, it allows time to bring up even the lowest performers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	FKMS only offered six sections of Intensive Math in 2016, and those six sections were only for 6th grade students. In 2017 FKMS build the Intensive Math Program up to 24 sections. In 2016, FKMS had 42% of all math students at the proficient level on FSA. In 2019, FKMS had 56% of all math students at the proficient level on FSA. Learning Gains in Math increased from 47% in 2016 to 59% in 2019. Math Learning Gains for the BQ increased from 37% in 2016 to 57% in 2019.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will maintain two Title I math teachers in the budget and in the SIP for 2020-2021 and will build a master schedule using the two additional teachers to either reduce class sizes in the general math classes or to teach additional intensive math sections.
2. We will monitor effectiveness by reviewing I-Ready data each quarter to look for progress of the intensive math students, as well as the regular math students. The intensive math teachers will work and plan with the general math teachers to monitor their students' progress. The intensive math teachers will concentrate teaching time based on the skills their students are struggling most with in the general math classes. The intensive math teachers will remediate the deficient skills in small group during intensive math. The regular math teachers will reteach deficient skills as well in the regular math class.

Person Responsible	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction- Offer more sections of Intensive Reading and/or Reduce class sizes in ELA classes. Rationale If FKMS hires an additional Intensive Reading/ELA teacher in sixth grade, class sizes could be reduced in ELA classes and more sections of Intensive Reading could be offered to our students.
Measurable Outcome:	If FKM offers more individualized and differentiated Reading/ELA instruction to our 6th grade students then the FSA ELA proficiency will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Adding Intensive Reading and reducing class-sizes to a level 1 or level 2 student's schedule allows time for the teacher to teach the non-proficient student from their level to build a stronger vocabulary and reading foundation, which allows such students to pass their regular ELA class and rise to a proficient score on FSA. If Intensive Reading is offered over a threeyear period during the middle school years, it allows time to bring up even the lowest performers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2016, FKMS had 39% of all ELA students at the proficient level on FSA. In 2019, FKMS had 42% of all ELA students at the proficient level on FSA. Learning Gains in ELA increased from 41% in 2016 to 49% in 2019. ELA Learning Gains for the BQ increased from 36% in 2016 to 40% in 2019.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will hire an additional ELA/Intensive Reading teacher for 6th grade. The principal will create a master schedule adding additional sections of Intensive Reading and ELA sections. The intensive reading teacher will monitor the I-Ready data weekly to set up small groups to remediate skills students are testing as deficient. The ELA teachers will monitor I-Ready data to reteach deficient skills as well.
2. We will monitor effectiveness by reviewing I-Ready data each quarter. The intensive reading teachers will work and plan with the general ELA teachers to monitor their students' progress. The intensive reading teachers will concentrate teaching time based on the skills their students are struggling with most by using the i-Ready data and lessons provided in i-Ready.

Person Responsible	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction- Provide additional support to teachers and students in Rigorous Teaching Strategies in both ELA and Reading. Rationale To assist teachers, including teachers of Students with Disabilities, in implementing rigorous teaching strategies in their classrooms to increase the percent of proficient students in ELA by 10% from 42% in 2019 to 52% in 2021, as measured on the FSA ELA; and our Students with Disabilities scoring proficiently on FSA in ELA will increase by 10% from 16% to 26% in 2021. The CAS will help train teachers in AVID strategies such as Socratic Circle, Focused Note Taking, WICOR strategies, Tutorials, etc.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with coaching and professional development on how to implement rigorous teaching strategies such as Socratic Circle, Focused Note Taking, WICOR strategies, and Tutorials, then FSA ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 10% from 42% to 52% in 2021 (general population)and from 16% to 26% in 2021 (Students with Disabilities).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Jones (renee.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID School-Wide Implementation Model & Teacher Walkthroughs of other high performing teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID teaching strategies promotes collaborative structures to engage students, which increases performance. FKMS is moving towards school-wide implementation. Teachers have more buy-in when they observe other teachers on their own campus. When a teacher can see good teaching in action, they are more likely to change their way of teaching or to try a new strategy. The administration of FKMS are seeing AVID strategies being implemented within the classrooms. 100% of the FKMS staff implemented at least one new AVID strategy in 2020.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Our CAS will offer a PD course once per month to the entire faculty covering the AVID strategies mentioned in the Intended Outcome. Each quarter, subs will be provided for teachers to complete walkthroughs in other teachers classrooms that will be modeling the same AVID strategies learned in the courses offered by (Content Area Specialist) or learned in the summer AVID training. Teachers will then have help implementing the new strategies by using what they learned in the walkthrough, the PD course and with assistance by the CAS, if needed. 2. Effectiveness will be monitored by reviewing the number of teachers volunteering to model the strategies and by the number of teachers signing up to complete walkthroughs. If the training is replicated and implemented appropriately by the teachers, the % of proficient ELA scores should increase by 10% from 42% to 52%, as measured by the FSA.

Person Responsible	Renee Jones (renee.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A need to support and communicate with parents of students who are in need of credit recovery was identified during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 debriefing of FSA, iReady diagnostics, and QSMA's data. These students constantly struggle with negative feelings such as " I will never be able to catch up". FKM believes that If students can complete PLATO courses during the school day, with the assistance of the lab manager and their families, then they will feel empowered and ready to move on to high school with their peers. They will be less likely to drop out of school when they are 16. If parents receive school updates twice per month, then students will stay on track to finish their PLATO courses during the school year and not have the need for summer school.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide consistent guidance and communication to the parents of students who are in need of credit recovery then the school-family relationships will strengthen helping decrease the number of students needing Summer school by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of decreasing the number of students needing to attend Summer school is to provide a paraprofessional who will communicate with parents constantly, foster home-school positive relationships, support counsel parents on how to help students at home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students can complete PLATO courses during the school day, with the assistance of the lab manager and their families, students will not feel like they can never catch up. Students recovering classes during the school year will be ready to move on to high school with their peers and will be less likely to drop out of school when they are 16. If parents receive updates often, students will stay on track to finish their PLATO courses during the school year and not have the need for summer school

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire a paraprofessional for one hour per day to call parents twice per month, giving them updates on their

children's progress in their PLATO courses.
2. Review call logs from para monthly.
3. Review PLATO completion rates monthly.

Person Responsible	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

#5. Other specifically relating to Technology	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A need to provide engaging and rigorous learning opportunities to ALL students was identified during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 debriefing of FSA, iReady diagnostics, and QSMA's data. FKM would like to continue the upright trend of the last three years as evident in the Math FSA. Additional technology access for both teachers and students could help increase the rigor and student engagement subsequently increasing FSA proficiency in all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	If we empower teachers with additional technology access then they could design and deliver more engaging and rigorous learning opportunities helping to increase FSA Math and ELA proficiency scores by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of increasing FSA ELA and Math proficiency scores by 5% are: - Providing teachers with additional technology access - Provide teachers with PD focused on using technology integration as a tool to develop and deliver engaging and rigorous lessons. Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps. All students have different interests, backgrounds, learning styles, and ability levels. It is imperative for educational institutions to recognize this and provide students with a tailored education to ensure their students a successful future. Smith, Grace & Throne, Stephanie. (2009). Differentiating Instruction with Technology in Middle School Classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to research, benefits of using technology in the classroom include: - Improves student engagement. - Improves knowledge retention. - Encourages individual learning. - Encourages collaboration. - Students can learn useful life skills through technology. - Enables teachers to differentiate instruction Providing each student with access to technology in the classroom, and at home in the case of distance learning needs, allows a student to be proficient on a computer to complete assignments remotely and independently.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Utilizing Title I supplemental funds, FKM will purchase 110+ Chromebooks, 4 Chromebook Carts and 4 Smartboards
2. Barcode each item and enter into the Destiny system to ensure accurate property records.
3. Provide teachers with PD focused on using technology integration as a tool to develop and deliver engaging and rigorous lessons.
4. Monitoring effectiveness of initiative will include by the administration by seeing the strategies being used in
the classrooms when completing classroom observations. If the training is replicated and implemented

appropriately by the teachers, then % of proficient ELA and Math scores should increase by 5% as measured by the FSA.

Person Responsible   Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All have been addressed.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

FKMS will build capacity for meaningful parent/family engagement by hosting a Literacy Night in November of 2020 and a Math Night in January of 2021. Our Literacy and Math Coaches will lead the activities to help parents with strategies and resources to assist their children at home with homework and FSA preparation (targeting families of students failing math and/or ELA). Parents will learn ways to help their children to become better readers and to read for fun. Parents will learn strategies to help their students solve real world mathematical applications. Parents will learn how to sign up and utilize the Parent Portal and their options if their child does fail a course. FKMS is building community relationships to help increase student achievement by teaming with businesses and organizations that serve our students. For example, FKMS now holds our awards ceremonies at the First Assembly of God, which is a beautiful and comfortable venue located near the school. FKMS does not have an auditorium to hold large-scale ceremonies. The partnership with the church allows a comfortable environment to celebrate the successes of our students. FKMS has teamed with Pediatric Associates of Ocala as a Business Partner. This partnership is providing funds to help purchase technology for our classrooms, as well as funds to help recognize students for good behavior and academic progress. Our local Zaxby's restaurant has collaborated with FKMS to help provide resources of food for student recognition events, as well as staff luncheons. These partnerships promote student achievement and boosts moral by both students and staff, which helps create a positive culture at the school level.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$117,215.33
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0221 - Ft. King Middle School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$117,215.33
			Notes: Notes 2 teacher salaries and fringe			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$58,607.66
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0221 - Ft. King Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$58,607.66
			Notes: Notes 1 teacher salary & fringe			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$63,395.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0221 - Ft. King Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$63,395.00
			Notes: Notes CAS salary and fringe			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				$3,034.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	160-Other Support Personnel	0221 - Ft. King Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.01	$3,034.00
			Notes: Notes Para 1 hour per day for 180 days and fringe			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Technology				$36,909.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	0221 - Ft. King Middle School	Title, I Part A		$36,909.00
			Notes: Notes Chromebooks, carts and Smartboards			
					Total:	**$279,160.99**