

Manatee County Public Schools

Martha B. King Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 10/7/2018

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 (55%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	61%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kreiling, Kristin	Principal	
Spahn, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Kane, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/7/2018, 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

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

925

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

9

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

5

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	313	310	302	0	0	0	0	925
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	6	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	28	7	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	10	4	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	96	78	0	0	0	0	276
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	96	78	0	0	0	0	242
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	124	131	0	0	0	0	370

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	132	64	20	0	0	0	0	216

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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	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

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	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

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				43%	52%	54%	46%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	56%	54%	52%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	51%	47%	45%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				55%	59%	58%	54%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains				57%	61%	57%	60%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	54%	51%	57%	49%	51%
Science Achievement				36%	47%	51%	43%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	77%	72%	74%	84%	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	38%	52%	-14%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	43%	48%	-5%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2021					
	2019	49%	41%	8%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	48%	-12%
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	81%	77%	4%	71%	10%
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	100%	65%	35%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Quarterly District Benchmarks

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	247/22.7%	33.2%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.8%	27.1%	
	Students With Disabilities	7.7%	5.5%	
	English Language Learners	9.5%	22.6%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	253/37.5%	270/35.5%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.9%	37.6%	
	Students With Disabilities	13.8%	15.8%	
	English Language Learners	21.5%	35.2%	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	245/29.8%	250/34.4%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.4%	27.6%	
	Students With Disabilities	7.6%	13.5%	
	English Language Learners	14.9%	19.8%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	192/29.7%	216/43.1%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.4%	40.7%	
	Students With Disabilities	16%	32.1%	
	English Language Learners	20%	35.1%	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	231/63.2%	234/66.3%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	58.5%	63.4%	
	Students With Disabilities	34.5%	55.9%	
	English Language Learners	48.7%	46%	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	258/44.6%	277/49.5%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.4%	44.5%	
	Students With Disabilities	18.9%	25.6%	
	English Language Learners	21.9%	36.2%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	173/56.7%	204/52.4%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	51.7%	
	Students With Disabilities	46.9%	33.4%	
	English Language Learners	46.8%	45.1%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	241/30.6%	278/35.6%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.5%	27.9%	
	Students With Disabilities	16.7%	22%	
	English Language Learners	10.8%	14.8%	

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	14	21	18	19	30	30	19	36			
ELL	21	32	27	30	43	50	16	50	53		
ASN	92	75		85	69						
BLK	12	25	26	20	33	26	7	30			
HSP	31	38	30	40	45	48	31	57	62		
MUL	53	48	40	49	55	36	38	73			
WHT	55	53	40	67	55	41	50	76	80		
FRL	32	38	31	40	43	37	30	58	60		
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		

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	48
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	37
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
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	44
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	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The data component that showed the lowest performance 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 are also infusing vocabulary into Intensive Reading curriculum as well as continuing to use IXL, a computer based science curriculum.

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

Math scores in the lowest quartile were down 13% from the prior year. Students in the prior year were not placed correctly 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.

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

Multiple educational platform changes causing a lack of consistency was the main factor. More progress monitoring, more frequent classroom walks, and movement of staff to address specific grade level interventions will be needed to address these improvements.

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

Social Studies achievement went up 7% from the previous year. Based on the 19-20 results, more emphasis will be put on Civic for the 21-22 school year.

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

Level 1 and 2 students received infused instruction and strategies that allowed for a more gradual approach towards the curriculum. Also, students were placed correctly into the civics courses based on their achievement levels, and not just solely their grade level.

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

Level 1 and 2 students will need the Civics curriculum infused into their 7th grade Social Studies classes. Intensive Reading classes will also use Civics related passages to strengthen reading skills and assist in building a base knowledge of the civics curriculum.

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.

*Intensive Reading teachers will meet regularly with the Reading coach to insure strategies and subject matter are on point.

*Both 7th grade and 8th grade Social Studies Teachers will have opportunity for same time, collaborative lesson planning.

*Lunch and Learn Trainings to discuss strategies as well as curriculum.

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

*Students in 6th and 7th grade are teamed, allowing staff to collaborate. Intentional reviews can now take place as student progress will be more readily available from one teacher to the next. Also, our new reading coach will be collaborating with all departments to insure that appropriate and relevant curriculum is being used. King Middle School will also be implementing a Homeroom.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**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:

- *Students attending school less than 90% of the time will decrease from 13% to 10%.
- *Discipline will drop from 2013 referrals by 25% to 1500.
- *Faculty attendance at voluntary professional development will increase from 25%-50%.

Monitoring:

*Referral data, attendance, and staff participation in professional development will be pulled quarterly and assessed. Adjustments will be made as needed.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

- *King Middle School will involve families in greater communication about attendance.
- *Implementation of processes, procedures, and structures to decrease discipline referrals and to clearly communicate expectations.
- *Provide high impact professional development using data and teacher feedback.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

- *Clearly communicated processes, procedures and structures will provide all stakeholders with the tools needed to be successful.
- *Efficient communication will assist in building culture of collaboration between school and families.
- *Using teacher feedback will allow teacher thoughts and voices to be valued as an integral piece to building a collaborative culture.

Action Steps to Implement

- *MTSS will meet weekly and review student attendance and make positive contact through postcards with families of students missing multiple days in a row.
- *Regular and frequent parent contact, including postcards and phone calls, will occur bi-weekly to families of students with attendance concerns.
- *Develop, clearly communicate, and follow school discipline log to insure the following of the discipline matrix
- *Collaborate with families of students receiving discipline to develop positive interventions and relationships that decrease student discipline incidents.
- *Allow teachers opportunities to share in the development of professional development opportunities through collaborative planning.
- *Continued implementation of the character strong curriculum, to target all students but emphasizing the needs of our African American and Hispanic students. Collaboration with district Character Strong Liaison to problem solve for the needs of King students.
- *Ongoing training for all staff, including SRD and LPN, in social and emotional wellness.

Person Responsible

Jessica Kane (kanej@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus	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.
Description and Rationale:	School Wide Data goals are listed below. These goals were adjusted from previous years and drops in achievement due to the COVID pandemic.
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%
Monitoring:	*Weekly Lesson Plans turned in by teachers *ILT monthly meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Kreiling (kreilink@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase Rigor and accountability for students to meet high expectations through Character Education curriculum. Homeroom has been added to accommodate the time needed so that rigor and character building can occur.
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

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

Person Responsible Kristin Kreiling (kreilink@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The school leadership team meets monthly and reviews 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.

King Middle is continuing with the Character Strong for the 21-22 school year. All teachers/staff meet via grade level, department, and as a faculty a minimum of one time a month.

This year, students will participate in 30 character based lessons during a new homeroom time, aimed at building better character and leaders on the King campus.

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

The information will also be shared at SAC meetings.

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

Administrative Team: Further implementation of the Character Strong curriculum, Analyzing data, and Communicating with all stakeholders.

SAC: acting as a liaison between the community and the school, supporting initiatives that benefit the students.

Staff: implementing new programs as well as analyzing data and forming instruction to benefit all students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------