

Manatee County Public Schools

Martha B. King Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Martha B. King Middle School

600 75TH ST NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

<https://www.manateeschools.net/king>

Demographics

Principal: Michael Mullen

Start Date for this Principal: 9/8/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 (55%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Martha B. King Middle School

600 75TH ST NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

<https://www.manateeschools.net/king>

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	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Martha B. King Middle School is to prepare the King community for the challenge and demands of the 21st century by facilitating the acquisition of knowledge, skills and experiences necessary to reach individual potential..

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our greatest contribution is to be sure there is a teacher in every classroom who cares that every student, every day, learns and grows to feel like a real human being.

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
Kreiling, Kristin	Principal	
Kane, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Spahn, Jason	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/8/2020, Michael Mullen

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.*

3

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 (55%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	314	320	336	0	0	0	0	970	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	36	68	0	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	75	115	0	0	0	0	243	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	42	61	0	0	0	0	134	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	96	78	0	0	0	0	276	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	96	78	0	0	0	0	242	

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	73	25	30	0	0	0	0	128

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	64	71	0	0	0	0	184	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	82	108	0	0	0	0	244	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	25	0	0	0	0	62	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	127	140	0	0	0	0	414	

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	61	82	99	0	0	0	0	242

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	64	71	0	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	82	108	0	0	0	0	244
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	25	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	127	140	0	0	0	0	414

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	61	82	99	0	0	0	0	242

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43%	52%	54%	48%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	56%	54%	49%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	51%	47%	39%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	58%	60%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	57%	64%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	51%	54%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	36%	47%	51%	45%	39%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	77%	72%	66%	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	38%	52%	-14%	54%	-16%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	43%	48%	-5%	52%	-9%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	54%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	49%	41%	8%	46%	3%
	2018	47%	41%	6%	45%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	36%	45%	-9%	48%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	45%	-2%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	81%	77%	4%	71%	10%
2018	70%	78%	-8%	71%	-1%
Compare		11%			
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	100%	65%	35%	61%	39%
2018	100%	65%	35%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	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	15	33	36	25	40	33	13	36			
ELL	17	39	37	32	42	38	13	54	58		

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
ASN	80	62		94	86						
BLK	18	35	45	23	42	39	9	59			
HSP	28	44	41	40	48	39	19	62	66		
MUL	53	43		60	37						
WHT	61	55	49	74	68	60	55	94	81		
FRL	30	41	41	41	48	42	23	71	60		
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	11	37	42	20	46	49	4	50			
ELL	11	41	45	28	54	58	6	50			
ASN	91	73		91	73						
BLK	23	40	44	22	47	58	13	57			
HSP	29	43	42	40	54	54	23	62	51		
MUL	47	59		52	68		46				
WHT	63	60	53	71	68	58	59	84	69		
FRL	34	45	44	43	55	57	31	65	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	12	33	33	18	44	44	23	24			
ELL	16	41	38	33	55	57	3	36			
ASN	82	70		82	70						
BLK	18	30	33	30	51	45	26	33	35		
HSP	33	47	41	49	62	57	25	51	44		
MUL	53	55	50	50	61		64	60			
WHT	63	55	43	76	70	61	63	80	67		
FRL	33	43	37	48	61	53	30	53	46		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	81
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	48
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	66
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	44
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science where King students were down 7% from the prior year, 11% below the district, and 15% below the state average. We believe the correct emphasis was not put into scaffolding standards. We have addressed this by adjusting staff, lesson plan templates, and accountability for lesson planning. We also are infusing Science vocabulary into our Intensive Reading curriculum as well as continuing the use of IXL, a computer based curriculum, into the science classrooms.

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

Math scores in the lowest quartile were down 13% from the prior year. Students in the prior year were not properly placed into the Intensive Math classes. This year, all level 1's and bottom quartile 2's have been appropriately placed into Intensive Math. We also have strategically placed staff to allow for maximum effectiveness in each grade level.

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.

Science data showed 15% difference from the state average. We believe the correct emphasis was not put into scaffolding standards. We have addressed this by adjusting staff, lesson plan templates, and accountability for lesson planning. We also are infusing Science vocabulary into our Intensive Reading curriculum as well as continuing the use of IXL, a computer based curriculum, into the science classrooms.

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

Social Studies achievement was up 7% from the prior year. Level 1 and level 2 students received infused instruction and strategies that allowed for a more gradual approach towards the curriculum.

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

13% of students had a less than 90% attendance rate

39% of students had a level 1 on FSA

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

1. ELA
2. Science
3. Math
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we communicate clear, consistent expectations in a positive manner, then discipline, attendance, and morale will improve.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>*Students attending school less than 90% of the time will decrease from % to %</p> <p>*Discipline will drop from 1080 incidents by 25% to 810.</p> <p>*Faculty attendance at voluntary professional development will increase from 25% to 50% attending regularly.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>*King Middle School will involve families in greater communication about attendance.</p> <p>*Implementation of processes, procedures, and structures to decrease discipline referrals and to clearly communicate expectations.</p> <p>*Provide high impact professional development using data and teacher feedback.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>*Clearly communicated processes, procedures, and structures will provide all stakeholders with the tools need to be successful.</p> <p>*Efficient communication will assist in building a culture of collaboration between the school and families.</p> <p>*Using teacher feedback will allow teacher thoughts and voices to be valued as an integral piece to building the foundation for collaboration.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. MTSS will meet weekly and review student attendance and make positive contact through postcards with families of students missing multiple days in a row.
2. Regular and frequent parent contact, including post cards and phone calls, will occur bi-weekly to families of students with attendance concerns.
3. Develop, clearly communicate, and follow the school discipline log to insure following of discipline matrix.
4. Collaborate with families of students receiving discipline to develop positive interventions and relationships that decrease student discipline incidents. African American
5. Allow teachers opportunities to share in the development of professional development opportunities through collaborative planning.
6. Implementation of character education program, Character Strong, to target all students but emphasizing the needs of our African American and Hispanic students. Collaborate with district Character Strong Liaison to problem solve for the needs of King students.

Person Responsible Jessica Kane (kanej@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	If instructional faculty develops and implements standards based lesson plans using grade level materials and district pacing, then student achievement will occur in all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement 50% ELA Gains 52% ELA L25 55% Math achievement 58% Math Gains 64% Math L25 63% Science achievement 45% Civics achievement 85% Acceleration 92%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Kreiling (kreilink@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase Rigor and accountability for students to meet high expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing Rigor will require teachers to develop and implement standards based lesson plans using the item specifications and student data to inform instruction. It will also require teachers to use new district pacing guidelines to ensure all students meet the expectations of all standards according to state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly lesson plan review and feedback by administration. SWD and ELL
2. Reading coach providing high impact strategies across the curriculum and embedded into lesson plans. SWD and ELL
3. Monthly professional development provided by high impact staff members on campus.
4. Completing bi-weekly classroom visits and then problem solving observed trends as an administrative team.
5. Provide feedback/professional development based on observations.
6. District curriculum support to improve implementation of ELL strategies on a weekly basis.
7. Bi-weekly data chats will occur in all intensive reading classrooms.

Person Responsible Kristin Kreiling (kreilink@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership meets monthly and reviews District GAP test data, Quarterly Benchmarks and other areas aligned with content specific standards to monitor, assess and revise the 'needs of our students'.

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 is implementing Character Strong during the '20-'21 school year. All teachers/staff meet via grade level, department and as a faculty a minimum of one time a month.

All students will participate in 30 character based lessons throughout the duration of the school year.

Additionally, school culture and discipline data will monitored/analyzed so that additional character lesson plans can be implemented where needed.

The information will also be shared and discussed at SAC meetings.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00