

Manatee County Public Schools

Martha B. King Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

To make King Middle School a place where teachers want to teach, and students want to learn.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mullen, Michael	Principal	
Spahn, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Sperduto, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher
Baker, Karyn	School Counselor	
Evans, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Clark, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Kambrick, Sue	School Counselor	
Baker, Pam	Teacher, K-12	
Knips, Sophie	Teacher, K-12	
Edelkind, Shane	Teacher, K-12	
Takacs, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Beltran, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Michael Mullen

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

843

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

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	251	308	284	0	0	0	0	843	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	53	57	0	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	0	0	0	0	70	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	0	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	110	108	0	0	0	0	286	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	101	83	0	0	0	0	257	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	20	34	0	0	0	0	84	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	40	50	50	0	0	0	0	140	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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 9/6/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	49%	50%				43%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						48%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						43%	51%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	35%	36%				55%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%						57%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						44%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	57%	53%				36%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	54%	58%				81%	77%	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	2022					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	43%	48%	-5%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	41%	8%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	48%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	77%	4%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	65%	35%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	10	26	28	20	36	36	15	28			
ELL	11	29	29	29	41	44	5	42			
ASN	67	27		67	75						
BLK	4	23	29	12	33	34	4	37			
HSP	27	35	28	44	52	46	19	58	80		
MUL	30	29		53	51		42	69			
WHT	55	48	40	73	69	67	51	84	93		
FRL	24	34	30	41	52	47	21	57	84		
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		

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
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		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

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%	1
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	59
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	46
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	64
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

King Middle School indicates the largest downward trend over a 4 year period in the areas of ELA, ELA gains, ELA L26 learning gains, and 8th grade science proficiency. King also indicated a smaller upward trend over a 4 year period in the area of math L25 learning gains and acceleration.

King Middle School also indicates lower performance with our ESE, ELL, black, and Hispanic subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The following areas are King Middle School's greatest needs for improvement.

8th Grade Science proficiency
 ELA proficiency
 ELA gains
 ELA L25 gains

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

Contributing factors to lower ELA achievement were students not being motivated to attempt the work, teachers unfamiliar with content due to staff turnover, students rebounding breaks in traditional classroom instruction due to covid situations.

Lack of student motivation will be addressed by an increase of morale building and rewarding structures such as teacher collaboration opportunities, Renaissance, data chats with students, and strategic and frequent relationship building activities. Teachers will be offered support by admin and district specialists, as well as an improved intention for collaboration time.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The following areas indicate King Middle School's greatest improvements.

Acceleration
 Math learning gains
 Math L25 learning gains

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

The main contributing factors to the math achievement was a deliberate process for selection of students into Algebra I honors and Geometry Honors. Additionally the math teachers for these courses are skills at building relationships and offering multiple tutoring and help opportunities. There was a lower teacher turnover in the math department, which also lead to an increased achievement.

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

To accelerate learning, King Middle School will maintain the practice of selecting students for Algebra I Honors and Geometry strategically, taking into consideration the student, their grades, and their support systems both at home and at school. They will be supported through math practice help during lunch and morning time by the math teacher.

Students are offered English I Honors in 8th grade as a high school course. This is supported and the process maintained through the English Department.

Additionally, opportunities for high achieving clubs' co-curricular courses are encouraged, such as Digital Information Technology (HS Course), Technology Student Association, Future Health Professionals, and Future Business Leaders of America.

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.

Regarding math, additional opportunities for supporting accelerating learners may be needed. This may extend beyond the math teacher classroom time. Scheduling by administrators and effective math practice help will be provided to support staff that may assist outside of classroom time.

Regarding English I Honors, all English teachers are encouraged to collaborate in person and electronically. The curriculum development is supported through ongoing, district provided PD and 1:1 district specialist help.

Teachers of clubs are encouraged to visit other schools and invite school to King Middle in order to establish and grow our programs. The district is highly supportive of the CTE programs' successes.

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

Students will be offered after school tutoring with content area teachers. This will be available starting Q2 in the areas of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Subgroups indicated as areas of improvement will be offered specialized staff to assist their needs.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA Achievement score was below average last year at 35%. Our students are not meeting the needs for their graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the current school year, ELA Achievement will increase from 35% to 43% as measured by the end of year state assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ELA Achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth towards proficiency as indicated by FAST Reading Progress Monitoring, Lexia reading program, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strategies used for focused growth are teacher collaboration guided by district specialists as needed, PD on BEST standards, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative planning is a high yield strategy that is needed as we approach BEST standards and a new textbook. Student confidence and building relationships is key and approached through data chats and tutoring opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School administrator with the help of a district specialists will establish times and structures for collaborative planning that is focused and useful.

Person Responsible

Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

Department chair and administrator will guide the department on progress monitoring tools such as FAST PM, Lexia reading program data, holding student data chats, and aligning the goals with the collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Math Achievement proficiency score is a critical area due to the math skills needed for graduation. It was 52% last year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the current school year, Math Achievement will increase from 52% to 55% as measured by the end of year state assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Math Achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth toward proficiency as indicated by FAST Math Progress Monitoring, Dream Box math program, Acaletics monthly math diagnosis, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strategies used for growth are teacher collaboration guided by district specialists as needed, PD on BEST standards, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative planning is a high yield strategy that is needed as we approach BEST standards and a new textbook. Student confidence and building relationships is key through data chats and tutoring opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School administrator with the help of district math specialist will establish times and structures for collaborative planning that is focused and useful.

Person Responsible

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

Department chair and administrator will guide the department on progress monitoring tools such as FAST PM, Dream Box math program data, holding student data chats, and aligning the goals with collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

8th Grade Science Achievement score was below average last year at 30%, and was therefore identified as a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the current school year, 8th Grade Science Achievement score will increase from 28% to 33% as measured by the end of year state assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

8th Grade Science Achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth toward proficiency as indicated by district provided Progress Learning science program, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strategies used for growth are teacher collaboration guided by district specialists as needed, PD on science standards in context, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative planning is a high yield strategy that is needed as we approach science standards. Student confidence and building relationships is key through data chats, standards based experiments, and tutoring opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School administrator with the help of district science specialist will establish times and structures for collaborative planning that is focused and useful.

Person Responsible

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Department chair and administrator will guide the department on progress monitoring tools such as School City, district provided program data, holding student data chats, and aligning the goals and science labs with collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Civics Achievement score was 64% last year, and King Middle School would like to maintain and improve on the success.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the current school year, Civics Achievement will increase from 64% to 67% as measured by the end of year state assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Civics Achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth towards proficiency as indicated by district benchmarks and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strategies used for growth are teacher collaboration guided by district specialists as needed, PD on social studies/civics standards in context, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative planning is a high yield strategy that is needed as we approach civics standards. Student confidence and building relationships is key through data chats, context based text, and tutoring opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School administrator with the help of district social studies specialist will establish times and structures for collaborative planning that is focused and useful with opportunities for student practice.

Person Responsible

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Department chair and administrator will guide the department on progress monitoring tools such as School City, district provided student practice data, holding student data chats, and aligning the goals with collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Federal index for students with disabilities was 28% last year, for the 3rd consecutive year under 41% and 2nd consecutive year under 32%. Federal index for students identified as English Language Learners was 31% last year, for the 3rd consecutive year under 41% and 1st consecutive year under 32%. Federal index for black/African American students was 22% last year, for the 3rd consecutive year under 41% and 1st consecutive year under 32%. We are not meeting the academic needs for these identified subgroups, and this is a barrier for their academic success.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the current school year, outcomes for multiple subgroups identified as students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American students will increase to 42% as measured by the federal index.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student learning growth will be monitored by admin, ESE department chair, ELL lead teacher, student support specialists, teachers, and individual students for growth towards proficiency as indicated by FAST Reading Progress Monitoring, FAST Math Progress Monitoring, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strategies used for focused growth are teacher collaboration guided by instructional leadership team and admin as needed, PD on BEST standards, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
 Describe the

Collaborative planning is a high yield strategy that is needed as we approach BEST standards and new textbooks. Student confidence and building relationships is key through data chats and tutoring opportunities.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School administrators, department chairs, or counselors will pull data for subgroups upon conclusion of grading periods, FAST Progress Monitoring, and benchmarks.

Person Responsible Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

Department chairs, counselors, and individual teachers will facilitate individual students data chats and group tutoring opportunities.

Person Responsible Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Building a positive school culture and environment starts with the school leadership. King Middle School leadership is focusing on positive collaboration, student engagement, and professionalism to create an atmosphere where teachers want to teach and students want to learn. Teachers will be positively supported in the master schedule with collaborative team planning time, in Schoology for collaborative lesson planning space, PD opportunities from district or peer leaders, and paid for after school tutoring with academic focus. Department chairs are integral in the process of leadership that is an extension of the positive, engaging vision where teachers are acknowledge, supported, and focused on student achievement.

Recognitions for staff and students will be fostered throughout the year. Staff recognitions will include meals with followship opportunities, formal appreciation at faculty meetings, monthly parking acknowledgements,

and positive coaching.

Recognitions for students will be fostered throughout the year. Student recognitions will include quarterly Renaissance lunchtime rewards, opportunities for families to celebrate high performing students, weekly reading reward at lunchtime, weekly intensive math reward at lunchtime, and classroom rewards.

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

Student Support Specialists (Deans) and Counselors will provide positive academic structures for students, focusing on a calm and safe campus. Structures will include zero tolerance for classroom disruptions and violence, while accommodating individual student needs. Subgroups that were not being successful will be monitored for attendance, grades, and behavior to bridge the achievement gaps. There will be specific opportunities for tutoring as needed.

ESE Department Chair, ESE District Specialist, ESOL School Leader, and ESOL District Specialists will provide training and information to staff that help address individual student needs within the context of learning. There will be specific opportunities for tutoring as needed.

Teachers will create classroom management plans in the CHAMPS template to provide structure and support for student learning within the classroom. Each teacher will identify talking opportunities, participation and activity structures, and how they will be graded. Teachers will create common, grade level expectations for behavior practices and learning habits.