Fort King Middle School

2021-22 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: 4/21/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

> * 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.](http://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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	69%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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.

Fort King Middle School's mission is to develop the existing potential of all students by building relationships and providing opportunities to enhance individual success in an evolving society through Employment, Enlistment, or Enrollment pathways.

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	Position 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.
Gilmore, Rometha	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.
Pope, John	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.
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.
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.
Howe, Erin	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.
Kissane, Bobby	Dean	The student service manager is responsible to assist teachers, staff and students with the positive behavior system in order to reduce referrals and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		improve classroom management. He supervises transitions, has duty stations through out the day and provides support to maintain a safe environment. He supports the assistant principal of discipline whenever needed. He is an active part of the safety committee and multiple other school groups.
Runnels, Kerry	Dean	The student service manager is responsible to assist teachers, staff and students with the positive behavior system in order to reduce referrals and improve classroom management. He supervises transitions, has duty stations through out the day and provides support to maintain a safe environment. He supports the assistant principal of discipline whenever needed. He is an active part of the safety committee and multiple other school groups.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 4/21/2015, 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.*
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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
64

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,080

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	364	369	349	0	0	0	0	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	137	135	0	0	0	0	398
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	130	92	0	0	0	0	345
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	142	114	0	0	0	0	419
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	130	169	0	0	0	0	456
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	101	133	0	0	0	0	313
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	124	103	0	0	0	0	318
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	101	133	0	0	0	0	313

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	199	197	193	0	0	0	0	589

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	1	0	71	0	0	0	0	72
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	49%	54%	44%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	54%	54%	51%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	47%	48%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				56%	54%	58%	53%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				59%	58%	57%	67%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	50%	51%	66%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				41%	46%	51%	50%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				66%	70%	72%	65%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	43%	46%	-3%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	41%	14%	46%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	65%	-3%	71%	-9%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	54%	38%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:
• English Language Arts, Grades 6-8: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Mathematics Grades 6-8: Math Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Civics: Civics Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Science: Grade 8 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86 / 30%	68 / 21%	81 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51 / 23%	43 / 18%	49 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	1 / 2%	1 / 2%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 116 / 38% "	"Math 92 / 28% "	"Math 87 / 28% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 82 / 36% "	"Math 63 / 26% "	"Math 57 / 25% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 10 / 22% "	"Math 4 / 8% "	"Math 2 / 4% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 4 / 31% "	"Math 2 / 14% "	"Math 0 / 0% "

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	131 / 42%	96 / 29%	71 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84 / 39%	62 / 27%	40 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 18%	8 / 13%	6 / 10%
	English Language Learners	6 / 29%	1 / 4%	2 / 9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 150 / 51% Algebra 9 / 60% "	"Math 154 / 48% Algebra 13 / 87% "	"Math 125 / 42% Algebra 14 / 100% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 103 / 48% Algebra 3 / 50% "	"Math 106 / 46% Algebra 4 / 67% "	"Math 84 / 40% Algebra 5 / 100% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 21 / 34% Algebra 0 / 0% "	"Math 21 / 34% Algebra 1 / 100% "	"Math 16 / 27% Algebra 1 / 100% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 9 / 41% "	"Math 8 / 35% "	"Math 6 / 27% "
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	132 / 42%	162 / 51%	173 / 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83 / 38%	105 / 44%	109 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities	14 / 22%	16 / 25%	14 / 24%
	English Language Learners	7 / 30%	8 / 33%	10 / 43%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	75 / 27%	71 / 24%	61 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48 / 22%	43 / 19%	35 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 9%	2 / 4%	1 / 2%
	English Language Learners	1 / 9%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 89 / 49% Algebra 29 / 54% Geo 17 / 74%"	"Math 123 / 55% Algebra 23 / 43% Geo 17 / 74%"	"Math 99 / 50% Algebra 26 / 55% Geo 17 / 85%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 79 / 48% Algebra 13 / 45% Geo 8 / 80%"	"Math 102 / 53% Algebra 9 / 31% Geo 8 / 80%"	"Math 84 / 49% Algebra 10 / 42% Geo 8 / 100%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 10 / 25% Algebra 0 / 0% "	"Math 16 / 33% Algebra 0 / 0% "	"Math 14 / 33% Algebra 0 / 0% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 4 / 44% Algebra 1 / 33% "	"Math 4 / 44% Algebra 1 / 33% "	"Math 2 / 25% Algebra 0 / 0% "
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	87 / 32%	112 / 37%	104 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48 / 23%	66 / 29%	60 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 9%	6 / 12%	5 / 11%
	English Language Learners	1 / 9%	1 / 8%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	31	35	16	37	38	14	40			
ELL	8	35	36	17	43	38	15	50			
ASN	45	55		27	27						
BLK	23	36	34	19	34	37	15	39	32		
HSP	30	46	40	37	47	38	29	56	58		
MUL	29	36	20	32	42	47	25	79			
WHT	44	45	42	48	49	37	43	68	65		
FRL	30	40	36	32	42	36	23	53	39		

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		
WHT	51	51	42	63	68	69	59	71	73		
FRL	36	49	48	48	65	66	45	58	65		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	39
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

6th grade ELA data showed the greatest performance with having 40% proficiency in 2021. 7th grade had 27% proficiency, coming in last. Our current 7th grade students were our lowest performing students when looking at 2019 data as well. 8th grade had 38% proficiency in 2021. Students With Disabilities fell below the Federal Index with 32%. (Based on 2019 data)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our current 7th grade students in ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the district average with a 16% difference. 7th grade ELA data showed the lowest performance with having only 27% proficiency in 2021. 6th grade had 40%, while 8th came in at 38%. ELA in all areas demonstrates the greatest need for improvement due to data being flat across several years, not just based on the loss from 2019 to 2021.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The loss of key ELA & Reading teachers during the year caused several teachers to teach both subjects and required some to teach in areas they were not comfortable. Class sizes were larger than ideal due to lack of enough sections, which caused less one-on-one time between students and teachers. Adding additional sections of Intensive Reading sections and reducing the number of teachers teaching both ELA & Intensive Reading would help streamline training (PD) and allow more appropriate class sizes. FKMS could also better schedule Intensive Reading if an additional Intensive Reading Teacher was paid for out of Title I funds.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math has shown the most improvement over the past three years of data, but also experienced the largest drop in proficiency percentages compared to ELA in 2021. Even with the larger drops in proficiency for Math compared to ELA, Math is still ahead of ELA in all areas. ELA has 35% proficiency; Math has 38% proficiency. ELA Learning gains is at 42%, while Math Learning Gains is at 44%. ELA Learning Gains BQ is at 37%, while Math Learning Gains BQ is at 38%. This is a direct result of adding in intensive math classes to the master schedule 3 years ago.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The growth experienced in math over the past three years is a direct result of adding additional intensive math classes to the master schedule. Building foundational skills, including math facts, has continued to pay off. Adding the additional sections back in 2021-2022 will help regain the growth lost over the past year and a half.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1) Hire two additional Intensive Reading Teachers out of Title I funds, in addition to the four provided by the district.
2) Continue to fund an additional Intensive Math teacher our of Title I funds, in addition to the one provided by the district.
3) Hire a Content Area Specialist that has extensive knowledge in Reading Interventions and in delivering Professional Development in the areas of English / Language Arts.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The CAS (Content Area Specialist) will deliver PD on teaching strategies that enhances a teachers knowledge of engaging students in learning and collaborating with other students. The CAS will work with both the Reading and ELA department to better align the two in collaboratively panning together. The CAS will offer PD for the Reading teachers to help move students in our reading classes up and down in placement to make sure the students are properly placed, using progress monitoring data, teacher input and classroom data.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In order to sustain the plans of the 2021 - 2022 school year, the principal and leadership team will have to commit to using Title I funds to hire additional Intensive Reading, Intensive Math and a Content Area Specialist each year, not just in 2021-2022. The school will continue to progress monitor our non-proficient students and send quarterly reports home to parents.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction- Offer more sections of Intensive Reading in all levels of the reading progression to better serve non-proficient students in reading. If FMKS hires two additional Intensive Reading Teachers, in addition to the four provided by the district, non-proficient students in reading could be better placed and more fluidly moved up and down in the progression of intervention courses.

Measurable Outcome:	FKM will offer more sections of Intensive Reading and our FSA ELA proficiency will increase by 5% in our overall 6-8 ELA data in 2022 from 35% to 41%. Our SWD subgroup will increase the Federal Index % by 9% from 32% to 41%.
Monitoring:	The principal will monitor the placement of non-proficient students into the appropriate level of Intensive Reading classes by the Content Area Specialist and Assistant Principal of Curriculum. The progress monitoring data will be reviewed quarterly for proper movement up or down the progression of Intensive Reading courses. Progress monitoring reports will be sent home to parents quarterly. The administrative team will attend and monitor monthly collaborative lesson planning with ELA/Reading teachers and will conduct monthly walkthroughs of the classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Smallridge (gary.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Adding Intensive Reading 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 three-year 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. Continuing to offer Intensive Reading in 2021-2022 will help continue the trend of increasing the percentage of proficient students, as measured by FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will hire two additional ELA/Intensive Reading teachers for 6th - 8th grades. The principal will create a master schedule adding 12 additional sections of Intensive Reading sections. The intensive reading teachers, CAS and principal will monitor the quarterly progress monitoring data to make sure students are properly placed.

Person Responsible	Erin Howe (erin.howe@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Curriculum- Continue to offer Intensive Math to level 1 and 2 students 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 44% to 49% in 2022. The intended outcome is to keep the two additional math teachers on the roster and part of the master schedule for 2021-2022.
Measurable Outcome:	FKMS will continue to fund additional math intervention sections with our Title I budget & other available budgets, which will allow us to add 12 intensive math sections to the Ft. King Middle School master schedule. The percentage of proficient FSA math scores will increase by 5% from 38% to 43% and the percentage of level one or level two FSA math scores will decrease by 5% to 57% from 62%; and Students with Disabilities scoring proficient on FSA Math will increase by 10% from 22% in 2019 to 32% in 2022. We will increase the Federal Index for SWD by 9%, increasing from 32% in 2019 to 41% in 2022.
Monitoring:	The principal will monitor the master schedule to make sure the APC scheduled 12 additional sections of Intensive Math, above and beyond the normal 6 sections from a basic unit. Progress monitoring data available through I-Ready, Moby Max or Math 180 will be sent home quarterly to parents. The administrative team will attend and monitor monthly collaborative lesson planning with math teachers and will conduct monthly walkthroughs of the classrooms.
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. Intensive Math sections for 2021 were reduced due to unavailability of teachers and online students did not receive Intensive Math for the same reason. 2021-2022 will allow for the reduced sections to be restored.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will maintain two additional Intensive Math teachers in the budget and in the SIP for 2021-2022 and will build a master schedule using the two additional teachers to teach additional intensive math sections. (12)
2. We will monitor effectiveness by reviewing quarterly progress monitoring 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)

#3. Other specifically relating to Unit Recovery, moving on to high school	
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 2020-2021 school year. 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:	FKMS will provide consistent guidance and communication to the parents of students who are in need of credit recovery then the school-family relationships will strengthen. The strengthened relationships will help 100% of our PLATO students that are scheduled for at least one class period for a full semester, successfully complete a PLATO course.
Monitoring:	Phone call logs from the staff member making the calls and the number of completed PLATO courses within the school-year.
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 is to provide consistent communication from the school to the families, providing updates on their student's progress of PLATO courses.
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 or support staff member for one hour per day to call parents twice per month, giving them updates on their hildren's progress in their PLATO courses.
2. Review call logs from para monthly.
3. Review PLATO completion rates monthly.
4. Utilize any and all surplus Title I funds, after salaries, to purchase additional chrome books, chrome book carts, interactive boards or Smartboards, headphones and any needed software.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

na

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.

FKMS will build capacity for meaningful parent/family engagement by hosting a Literacy Night in November of 2021 and a Math Night in January of 2022. Our Literacy Coach 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Unit Recovery, moving on to high school	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**