Martin Luther King Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Martin Luther King Middle School

5928 STEWART ST, Milton, FL 32570

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/kms/

Demographics

Principal: Darren Brock

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2013

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)	70%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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

Martin Luther King Middle School

5928 STEWART ST, Milton, FL 32570

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/kms/

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	No	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To make our Cougars "King of the Hill" in reading, writing, math, science, technology, and positive attitudes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To motivate students to reach their potential through a joint effort of school resources, family support, and community involvement.

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
Brock, Darren	Principal	Provides strategic direction for the school by developing curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent involvement, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff and overseeing facilities.
Lee, Kelly	School Counselor	Coordinates testing and student schedules, and addresses student academic, social, and emotional needs.
Byers, Jamie	Dean	Supervises students safety and discipline.
Guy, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Provides teacher professional development (PD) for literacy and small group literacy intervention.
Marshall, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Provides teacher professional development for literacy and small group literacy intervention.
Baxley, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal to provide direction for the school by developing curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring students achievement, encouraging parent involvement, administering the budget, hiring, and evaluating staff and overseeing facilities.
Kimmons, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	Supervises IEP compliance and provides accommodations as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/24/2013, Darren Brock

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.*
1

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

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)	70%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	193	187	178	0	0	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	4	12	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	34	44	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	3	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	7	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/31/2020

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	217	214	225	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	40	39	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	19	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	9	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	107	134	0	0	0	0	316

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	88	113	128	0	0	0	0	329

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	217	214	225	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	40	39	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	19	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	9	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	107	134	0	0	0	0	316

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	88	113	128	0	0	0	0	329

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	45%	63%	54%	49%	63%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	60%	54%	57%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	56%	47%	54%	52%	44%
Math Achievement	47%	70%	58%	50%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	42%	65%	57%	48%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	58%	51%	47%	60%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	63%	51%	49%	63%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	77%	72%	73%	84%	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	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
	2018	35%	60%	-25%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	59%	-18%	52%	-11%
	2018	30%	56%	-26%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	44%	68%	-24%	56%	-12%
	2018	56%	71%	-15%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	46%	66%	-20%	55%	-9%
	2018	45%	63%	-18%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	54%	-23%	54%	-23%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	54%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2019	45%	76%	-31%	46%	-1%
	2018	56%	77%	-21%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	62%	-20%	48%	-6%
	2018	54%	66%	-12%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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%	75%	-13%	71%	-9%
2018	68%	75%	-7%	71%	-3%
Compare		-6%			
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	75%	73%	2%	61%	14%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	73%	67%	6%	62%	11%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	65%	-65%	56%	-56%

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	21	44	43	26	33	23	38	29	40		
BLK	15	37	43	19	30	34	14	38			
HSP	38	52		42	43			40			
MUL	52	54	64	48	41	27	43	61	57		
WHT	48	54	53	49	44	39	48	65	58		
FRL	41	52	55	45	42	39	44	58	59		
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	22	32	29	31	45	41	45	43	18		
BLK	32	36	25	34	41	32	50	44			
HSP	36	38		52	55						
MUL	51	42	64	55	47	39	55	61	71		
WHT	41	41	42	55	49	49	59	70	62		
FRL	38	38	42	51	48	50	52	68	56		
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	19	46	44	27	43	47	7	50			
BLK	36	43	38	28	31	40	20	67			
HSP	44	79		50	58						
MUL	53	57	64	43	50	50		71			
WHT	50	58	53	54	49	46	53	73	59		
FRL	44	54	54	45	46	47	43	67	51		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43

Hispanic Students	
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	50
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	51
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	48
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.

Seventh grade math data showed the greatest decline in the lowest 25% percentile (47%-37%) from the prior year. The contributing factor was that KMS had two rookie teachers teaching 7th grade math who are still building knowledge based skills with standards and test specifications.

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

Seventh grade math data showed the greatest decline (44%-31%) from the prior year. The contributing factor was that KMS had two rookie teachers teaching 7th grade math who are still building knowledge based skills with standards and test specifications. Also, all seventh grade students at KMS who scored in the top 25% on the 6th grade FSA in 2018 were assessed using the 8th grade FSA in 2019 which is in compliance with Santa Rosa County District guidelines.

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.

Seventh grade math data component showed a gap of 23% when compared to the state average. The contributing factor was that KMS had two rookie teachers teaching 7th grade math who are still building knowledge based skills with standards and test specifications. Also, all seventh grade students at KMS who scored in the top 25% on the 6th grade FSA in 2018 were assessed using the 8th grade FSA in 2019 which is in compliance with Santa Rosa County District guidelines.

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

In ELA 6th grade improved 11%, SWD increased 12%, SWD lowest 25% grew 25%, African American subgroup improved 18%. KMS implemented more intensive data driven instruction in the 6th grade. KMS' new literacy coach identified the subgroups and provided strategies and support for direct instruction. In addition, KMS added certified and highly qualified instructional support for students with disabilities.

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

KMS's greatest areas of concern are our subgroups of SWD and African American achievement in math and 8th grade ELA.

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

1. Math
2. ELA
3. SWD achievement
4. Black student achievement
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 FSA students with Disabilities scored 21% on FSA ELA, 26% on FSA math, 38% on NGSS science, 29% on Civics EOC and 29% earned middle school acceleration points. All of these areas are well below the expected 41% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities will improve on the 2021 FSA ELA 20%, 15% in math FSA scores, 5% in science FCAT, and 12% in Civics EOC as well as improve 12% more, earning middle school acceleration points in order that KMS reach the 41% proficiency level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize instructional differentiation to design and implement lessons based on learning styles, students' interest, and students' abilities. Teachers will also employ differentiation for assessments based on the latter. Methods of differentiation include but are not limited to the process (addressing various learning styles), the product students use to demonstrate mastery of the content, and/or classroom management techniques that support a safe and supportive learning environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Carol Ann Tomlinson's research shows that the effectiveness of differentiation benefits a wide range of students especially students with learning disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in a minimum of five hours of professional development that addresses the needs of students with disabilities, such as the webinars by PS/RtI Project.
2. Teachers will include one goal in My Learning Plan that will address the needs of students with disabilities in their classrooms.
3. Teachers will participate bi-quarterly MTSS meetings to discuss and share student interventions that are working for at risk students.
4. KMS will provide funding for the Dean of Students, Guidance Counselor, and ESE Department chairperson to attend Oppositional, Defiant and Disruptive Children and Adolescents seminar in Pensacola in December.
5.Teachers will participate in professional learning committees addressing instructional and assessment strategies for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	African-American students scored less than proficient on the 2019 FSA ELA and Math, NGSS Science, and the Civics EOC. The assessment scores from 2018 to 2019 decreased as follows: ELA 32% to 15%, Math 34% to 19%, NGSS science 50% to 45% and Civics EOC 44% to 38%.
Measurable Outcome:	King Middle School African-American students scores will improve on 2021 FSA ELA by 32%, math by 19%, science scores by 5%, and Civics EOC by 38%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	King Middle School will use various strategies to build and improve relationships with African-American students. According to Hattie's research building relationships contributes 72% toward student success. Programs such as Capturing Kids' Hearts will be used to develop relationships with all students especially African-American students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that when teachers demonstrate that they care for the learning of each student there are higher achievement outcomes. Research also indicates when instruction is differentiated based on social and cultural differences, African-American students have a higher achievement rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. New teachers and educational support employees will attend professional development in Capturing Kids' Hearts and implement techniques learned to build relationships with students.
2. Teachers and educational support personnel previously trained in CKH will continue to use strategies to build relationships with students.
3. Students will use Edmentum's Study Island to practice skills and build knowledge in all four core content areas.
4. Teachers will be provided professional development in the differentiation of instruction based on students' needs.

Person Responsible   Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-19 the overall FSA math achievement decreased by 6%: learning gains decreased 6%; the lowest 25th percentile decreased 10%. In addition, KMS students' achievement averaged 23% below the district average. Math proficiency in middle school ensures higher high school graduation rates, higher college admission rates, higher technical education rates, and allow students greater opportunities to enter the workforce with ease.
Measurable Outcome:	King Middle School overall math achievement will improve 5 percentile points in math achievement, learning gains will grow 6% and the lowest 25th percentile will increase by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Students who were not proficient on the math FSA are scheduled in intensive math classes for one semester. Teachers will use progress monitoring data from STAR assessments to identify standards where students lack proficiency and target instruction to achieve mastery. 2. Students will use Discovery Education and Gizmo in math classes to practice strategies and skills in order to reach proficiency. 3. Teachers will use differentiated instruction to address students' unique needs when learning math skills and knowledge. 4.The AIS will provide intervention through small group instruction providing progress monitoring to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Research shows that students who participate in small group instruction demonstrate increased mastery of standards. 2. Research on teachers' use of differentiated instruction in the classroom has shown to meet the needs of diverse learners and improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students in intensive math classes will use Edmentum's Exact Path for customized assignments for students to work at their own levels.
2. Students in all math classes will use Edmentum's Study Island and/or Discovery Education and/or Gizmo to complete basic skills and content skills problem activities.
3. Students in all math classes will have access to technology (computers, etc.)
4. Teachers will participate in PLC's to focus on strategies to build collaboration, critical thinking, communication, and creativity.
5. All students are offered the opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities including Academic Team, the Robotics Club, and the STEAM/Genuis Club. These groups may compete on a district, state, and/or national level. These competitions would include overnight stays and necessary meals. Student participation in these clubs supports student achievement growth in STEAM, science and math skills.

Person Responsible	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	King Middle School experienced a decline of 12% from the 2018 to 2019 NGSS Science. In comparison to the state average, KMS 8th grade students averaged 6% less and similarly, scored 20% less than the school district average of 62%.
Measurable Outcome:	KMS 8th grade students will improve scores on NGSS Science to 54%, an increase of 12%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Science teachers at KMS will implement or continue to implement interactive notebooks to utilize non-linguistic representations of science concepts, skills, and vocabulary terms, to summarize science content, and build retention of knowledge. 2. Teachers will use peer-tutoring learning strategies in the science classroom to increase student comprehension of grade-level texts and overall student achievement. 3. Students will use Discovery Education and Gizmo in science classes to practice strategies and skills in order to reach proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Marzano's research shows that summarizing and note-taking with graphic organizers are two of the most powerful skills students can cultivate to improve their understanding of academic content. 2. The use of peer-tutoring learning strategies has demonstrated positive effects in increasing the achievement of diverse learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Science PLC will focus on the use of interactive notebooks in the science classroom, building on the knowledge gained last year from the reading coach.
2. Science teachers use data from Performance Matters to target instruction and progress monitor.
3. Science teachers will use Kesler, NEARPOD and other resources to engage students in science content, critical thinking and interpretation, analysis, evaluation, explanation, and reflection.
4. All science classes will use Edmentum's Study Island to practice basic and content skills problem activities.
5. Students in all science classes have access to computers.
6. All students are offered the opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities including Academic Team, Robotics Club, and STEAM/Genius Club. These groups may compete on a district, state, and/or national level. These competitions would include overnight stays and necessary meals.

Person Responsible	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-19, ELA achievement improved in all areas of the school grade component; however, KMS scored 45% proficiency in ELA achievement which is 9% below the state average of 54% and 18% below the district average. Learning gains in ELA improved to 52%; however, the state average was 54% while the district learning gains averaged 60%. KMS' lowest 25th percentile increased 12% from 41% to 53% but still fell below the district average of 56%. Acquiring language arts proficiency will afford our students an ease of transition through middle school and into high school. This proficiency will give an ease of transition from middle school to high school as well as insure higher high school graduation rates, higher college admission rates, higher technical education rates and allow students greater opportunities to enter the workforce with ease.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA FSA scores will improve 5% in overall ELA achievement, 5% in learning gains, and 5% in lowest 25th percentile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Level I students on the ELA FSA are enrolled in intensive ELA classes that are smaller classes with a maximum of 18 students which allows for small group instruction.These classes use progress monitoring data from STAR to identify standards where students demonstrate weaknesses and group students based on these weaknesses to provide targeted instruction either in groups or individually. Level II students receive small group intervention from a reading endorsed/certified teacher. Renaissance is used to target instruction, provide research based curriculum and progress monitor these students. 2. All ELA classes use the district adopted curriculum, which is evidenced-based. 3. Teachers will utilize Study Island and Write Score to support students' mastery of reading comprehension and sourcing information for evidence-based writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Research shows that students who participate in small group instruction demonstrate increased mastery of standards. 2. Study Island, Write Score, and Renaissance provide opportunities to identify and implement differentiation to meets the needs of the different types of learners in an ELA classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All ELA, reading, social studies, and science classes will incorporate grade level appropriate complex text and incorporate inquiry based discussions.
2. All social studies classes implement Document-Based Questioning (DBQs).
3.Teachers will be trained on reading and text-dependent writing strategies that can be incorporated into their content areas.
4. ELA teachers will use data from two Write Score assessments (September and January) to align instruction in writing to students' needs in the use of document-based essay writing that simulates FSA writing test.
5. Intensive Reading classes may use Edmentum's Exact path to provide students with practice based on individualized assignments.
6. All ELA classes will use Edmentum's Study Island and Write Score to target student weaknesses and provide practice to improve mastery and retention of standards.

Person Responsible	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The area of focus in 3.A. addresses all of those identified in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/ Analysis.

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.

King Middle 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 by monthly parent and family involvement activities such as parent nights and family nights. Parents are welcomed to use the Parent Resource Room anytime during school hours. KMS plans events during school as well as evenings to accommodate parents' work schedules and provide multiple opportunities for parent involvement. Parents are welcome to use the Parent Resource Room anytime during school hours. Our School Advisory Council includes parents and community business leaders as members to discuss the school's performance and the needs of the students. SGA and Beta Club officers are also members of SAC to gather student viewpoints. SAC provides input and approval of the School Improvement Plan, Parent and Family Engagement Plan, Middle School Compact, and the school improvement budget. Title I funds an KMS teacher liaison to advise and guide the KMS PTO to support the school and its mission.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.