Marion County Public Schools

Fort King Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort King Middle School

545 NE 17TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Fort King, we are cultivating a community of motivated, enthusiastic individuals who have a desire to be a part of something bigger than themselves. We love our students and aim to build a culture of positivity, in which every learner can soar.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a better community, one student at a time.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carter, Michael	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.
Jones, Timothy	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.
Duncan, Lindsay	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.
Smith, Shawana	Other	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.
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.
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.
Bigby, Ualthan	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. The dean supervises transitions,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		has duty stations throughout the day, and provides support to maintain a safe learning environment campus wide. The dean supports the assistant principal of discipline whenever needed and serves as an active member of committees including Attendance Response, PBIS, Safety, and Family Engagement Committees.
Hamed, Riham	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. The dean supervises transitions, has duty stations throughout the day, and provides support to maintain a safe learning environment campus wide. The dean supports the assistant principal of discipline whenever needed and serves as an active member of committees including Attendance Response, PBIS, Safety, and Family Engagement Committees.
McMillian, Eric	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. The dean supervises transitions, has duty stations throughout the day, and provides support to maintain a safe learning environment campus wide. The dean supports the assistant principal of discipline whenever needed and serves as an active member of committees including Attendance Response, PBIS, Safety, and Family Engagement Committees.
Kissane, Bobby	Other	The Testing Coordinator leads all testing initiatives around campus and communicates with families, staff, and students about upcoming assessments and the results from those assessments. The Testing Coordinator also serves on different committees and supports the Assistant Principal of Instruction with instructional materials and proper implementation of reading and math interventions on campus.
Rivera, Casey	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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council is used to discuss the School Improvement Plan and focus on the development of action steps needed. The School Advisory Council is composed of school staff (administration, teachers, and non-instructional staff), family members of students, students, and members of the community. The principal also gathers teachers, non-instructional staff, and members of the school leadership team to review over data and further determine action steps that are needed to meet the school wide goals for academic, attendance, and behavior success.
During the school year, there are multiple Family Engagement Events that provide targeted resources for parents. During the Family Engagement Events, the school collects information about the relevancy of the event and what other information families are seeking to better support their child's learning.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored throughout the school year by both the School Advisory Council who meets monthly and also is discussed at leadership meetings at least monthly. If it is determined through school and state data that there needs to be an adaption to the SIP or that it is not being followed with fidelity, then adjustments will be made to the plan.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)*

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.*	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	123	132	425
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	100	114	262
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	40	39	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	87	66	166
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	127	156	353
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	83	112	296
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	210	228	582

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	17

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	143	144	403
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	88	97	226
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	162	149	378
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	157	124	393
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	108	132	315
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	108	116	298
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	223	249	642

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	32	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	14

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	143	144	403
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	88	97	226
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	162	149	378
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	157	124	393
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	108	132	315
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	108	116	298
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	223	249	642

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	32	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	14

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33			37	42	50	35		
ELA Learning Gains				42	41	48	42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34	31	38	37		
Math Achievement*	40			43	46	54	38		
Math Learning Gains				53	49	58	44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51	43	55	38		
Science Achievement*	34			37	40	49	32		
Social Studies Achievement*	41			58	65	71	58		
Middle School Acceleration	59			70			56		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	39			26			33		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	4	2
ELL	20	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	43			
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	2	
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	47			
FRL	36	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	52			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	42			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			40			34	41	59			39
SWD	11			15			4	11	30		5	
ELL	17			24			8	11			5	39
AMI												
ASN	33			53							2	
BLK	22			24			18	29	67		5	
HSP	30			36			38	37	57		6	38

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	38			37			30	55			4	
PAC												
WHT	39			51			39	49	59		5	
FRL	29			34			28	34	56		6	33

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	42	34	43	53	51	37	58	70			26
SWD	12	30	24	22	40	43	20	26				
ELL	17	39	44	22	48	43	19	19				26
AMI												
ASN	44	50		50	64							
BLK	24	38	42	25	46	53	15	43	55			
HSP	35	41	33	42	60	56	37	56	72			29
MUL	34	37		40	67	46	0	58				
PAC												
WHT	43	44	31	53	51	46	50	65	74			
FRL	32	39	33	37	50	51	31	54	64			27

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	42	37	38	44	38	32	58	56			33
SWD	9	31	35	16	37	38	14	40				27
ELL	8	35	36	17	43	38	15	50				33
AMI												
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			30
MUL	29	36	20	32	42	47	25	79				
PAC												
WHT	44	45	42	48	49	37	43	68	65			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	30	40	36	32	42	36	23	53	39			30

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	31%	37%	-6%	47%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	38%	-3%	47%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	24%	36%	-12%	47%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	44%	-6%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	41%	-18%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	45%	6%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	35%	37%	-2%	44%	-9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	44%	45%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	43%	52%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	58%	-19%	66%	-27%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 School Year was ELA Proficiency with 31% of students being proficient. There were several factors that contributed to this score being as low as it is. One of factor that contributed to the low proficiency score in ELA is that many of our students are struggling readers and have been identified as struggling readers for the majority of their educational career. Over one third of the student population is enrolled in a reading intervention course to support the student in acquiring the needed reading skills to move towards reading text at the appropriate lexile level. Another contributing factor is that 45.6% of students were deemed to be chronically absent from school for the school year. Also, 55.8% of students received a discipline referral and over one third of students received two or more referrals, both of which result in time that a student is not in class and therefore not receiving instruction in the classroom. The final contributing factor to the low proficiency scores is that 50% of the ELA teachers were not teaching consistently to the depth of the standard. This was evident through classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.

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

The data component that showed the largest decline from the prior year was in Civics where we dropped from 58% proficient to 40% proficient (18%). The decline is contributed to a combination of several factors. Two of the main contributing factors is that 45.6% of students were determined to be chronically absent from school and 55.8% of students received at least one discipline referral throughout the school year. Both of these result in the student missing time in the classroom and have gaps in the mastery of the standards being taught in the classroom. Another contributing factor is that mid-year a teacher left the school and students had to be moved to different classes and a teacher who never taught Civics had to begin teaching Civics mid-year to support the students. The final contributing factor to the decline is that the teachers were not planning together nor consistently teaching to rigor that the students needed to learn the content. This was observed through classroom walkthrough data, planning meeting attendance, and lesson plans.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

There were three components that had a similar gap between the school and the state average. Civics (27% difference), 7th Grade Math (25% difference), and 6th ELA (23% difference) are the three areas with the largest gap from the state average. The first two contributing factors to this large gap are that 45.6% of students were chronically absent and 55.8% of students received at least one discipline referral. Both of these factors result in time out of class and loss of instructional time causing gaps in the students instruction towards mastery of the standard. The other major factor is that teachers were not instructing to the depth of the standard and utilizing resources that did not meet the rigorous demands from the standard. This was observed through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and data collected from the district created assessments.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was with our Algebra 1 Honors students (4% increase). In order to achieve this increase, the administrative team reviewed over the student data collected at the beginning of the school year and identified the students who could succeed in the rigorous Algebra 1 classes. The teachers and administration utilized data throughout the year to create focused instructional supports to remediate and improve mastery of the content. Also, during the final quarter of the school year, a program specialist from the district taught the class while the teacher was out and during this time the program specialist accelerated the student learning through teaching and reteaching the standards that the students struggled in throughout the school year. These standards were identified through data review and formative assessments in the classroom.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two main areas of concern for the 2023-2024 school year are with the amount of students who are receiving referrals resulting in multiple days of suspension and the chronically absent students.

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

1. Address the behaviors that are disrupting and creating an unsafe learning environment.
2. Address the attendance concerns and decrease the amount of chronically absent students.
3. Support the teachers in planning and assessing to the depth of the standard.
4. Accelerate our students learning by providing the correct interventions to address the deficits

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Over 55% of the students at Fort King Middle School for the 2022-2023 School Year received at least one discipline referral and over one third of the student body received two or more discipline referrals. Students who are consistently receiving discipline referrals are usually being suspended from class and/or school and not able to be in the classroom to learn.
For the 2022-2023 School Year, 54% of the referrals originated from either black or multiracial students. Focusing on the percent of the population for each of the subgroups, 78% of black students, 65% of multiracial students, and 73% of students with disabilities received at least one referral.

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

If Fort King Middle School implements a school wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) model to support the school staff with classroom management, fostering positive relationships with students and the community, and provides further interventions for students with a higher need, then Fort King Middle School will see a decrease of at least 10% (55% to 45%) of students who are receiving discipline referrals.
If Fort King Middle School provides ongoing, differentiated professional development for teachers focused on being culturally responsive through research based practices from the PBIS Model and Eric Jenson's work and students receiving individual and group mentoring with outside agencies, then Fort King Middle School will see a decrease of at least 10% (78% to 68% black; 65% to 55% multiracial, 73% to 63% students with disabilities) of the black, multiracial, and students with disabilities students.

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

The progress towards achieving the desired outcome for this Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly reviews of discipline data identifying trends and problem solving, monthly PBIS team meetings to review data and develop staff professional development around classroom management and being culturally aware and responsive, and monitoring the data of the students who have been identified for individual and group mentoring with outside agencies focused on the students attendance, behavior, and grades. The mentor groups will also be included in the monthly PBIS meetings as active members contributing to the action planning and data review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Casey Rivera (casey.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

School Wide PBIS Model will be utilized to assist teachers with classroom management and teach students the school wide procedures and expectations. The PBIS model will also assist with problem solving and create a more positive school environment for staff and students.
Mentorships through different organizations that are trained in different forms of mentorship. The mentors will focus on students who need more support in order to make proper decisions and become productive members of the community.

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

These two interventions were chosen because they have been shown to be effective at other schools throughout Marion County Public Schools and for the students that they serve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Develop and implement the PBIS Model at the school

Person Responsible: Casey Rivera (casey.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 - Initial meeting October 2023 - regular meetings held with input from different stakeholders January 2024 - PBIS Bootcamp created by PBIS team and implemented

Select the students who need should be receiving the mentorship at the school based upon data and teacher input.

Person Responsible: Ualthan Bigby (ualthan.bigby@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Students are receiving regular mentoring through individual or group meetings. The discipline data is showing that the students selected are making more positive choices and having a decrease in referrals from previous year and current school year.

Person Responsible: Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 - regular meetings being held October 2023 - monthly review meetings begin January 2024 - see a decrease in referrals and increase in CICO points from teachers

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the 2022-2023 School Year, Fort King Middle School had 31% of students in ELA, 41% of students in Math, 39% of students in Civics, and 36% of students in Science be determined proficient through the subject specific state assessments.
For the 2022-2023 School Year, Fort King Middle School had 72% of students with disabilities (SWD) in ELA, 59% of SWD students in Math, 58% of SWD students in Civics, and 64% of SWD students in Science score a Level 1 on the subject specific state assessment. Also, Fort King Middle School had 77% of ELL students in ELA, 50% of ELL students in Math, 59% of ELA students in Civics, and 36% of ELL students in Science score a Level 1 on the subject specific state assessment.

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

If Fort King Middle School provides ongoing professional learning to support the teachers in knowing their benchmarks and collaboratively plan to the depth of the benchmark, then the students will increase in proficiency by at least 5% in ELA (31% to 36%), Math (41% to 46%), Civics (39% to 44%), and Science (35% to 39%).
If Fort King Middle School provides embedded professional learning focused on incorporating classroom strategies from Karen Novak's Universal Design for Learning focused on differentiated instruction and an inclusive environment for all students, then 40% of Students with Disabilities and ELL students at Fort King Middle School will show learning gains throughout the school year and move towards proficiency.

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

Fort King Middle School will monitor progress towards the desired outcome through regular classroom walkthroughs by the leadership team and utilizing a classroom walkthrough data collection tool to drive differentiated professional development and coaching for teachers and holding weekly collaborative planning sessions that are grade level and subject specific with a focus on defining the standard and how to assess the standard. The leadership team and teachers will review over common classroom, district, and state assessment data through data meetings to review over student growth and focus on areas of needed remediation. Teachers will regularly upload lesson plans to the portal for administrative review. Lesson plans will include differentiated instruction, accommodations made, and the strategies utilized to support the students with disabilities and ELL students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Lindsay Duncan (lindsay.duncan@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

According to John Hattie, planning and prediction has an effect size of .76 and collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. The evidence shows that if teachers can plan together at least one day per week with the purpose of understanding the benchmark and developing a common assessment, the teachers will understand and predict where the misconceptions will take place and at the same time the teachers will develop pedagogical knowledge and confidence in the standards that they are teaching.

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

Having collaborative planning that focuses upon understanding the benchmarks and developing common assessments will provide a framework in which our teachers can best determine approaches they will use to address and assess the benchmarks with their students. The deeper understanding of the benchmarks from collaborative planning will facilitate classroom instructional activities that will allow students to understand the full scope of the benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a schedule based upon teacher tiered levels for classroom walkthroughs and teacher coaching support. After creation, the process will need to be implemented with fidelity of regular walks taking place weekly and tracking through the classroom walkthrough data collection tool. Feedback must be provided to teachers to continuously improve. The data will be reviewed monthly to determine teacher growth and next steps.

Person Responsible: Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023 - Schedule and coaching assignments created and shared. Teacher Dashboard and CWT tool created October - Process is fluid: regular meetings with teachers and leadership team

Develop and implement professional learning focused on tier one instruction planning and implementation, knowing the standards, and assessment development.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Duncan (lindsay.duncan@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September - plan is developed and teachers are targeted for specific professional learning based upon their lesson plans and assessment development

Bring in a consultant to conduct professional learning focused on the what, how, and why of lesson planning and building a cohesive instructional model to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Develop and implement a professional learning plan to provide teachers different Universal Design strategies focused on inclusive environments in their classrooms. The ELL paraprofessionals will conduct specific trainings on the different strategies to support multilingual students in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Duncan (lindsay.duncan@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 - Monthly strategies are taught and modeled through Friday Faculty Focus meetings.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the 2022-2023 School Year, Fort King Middle School had 45.6% of its students considered to be chronically absent and another 10% on the verge of becoming chronically absent. The lower performing subgroups showed that 50.5% of black students, 42.4% of multiracial students, 42.9% of students with disabilities, and 44.2% of ELL students were chronically absent during the 2022-2023 school year. Students who regularly miss school fall further behind and are more likely to be retained and eventually drop out from school.

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

If Fort King Middle School focuses on creating a creating a school-wide positive and inviting atmosphere through PBIS, then there will be a decrease of 5% schoolwide (45.6% to 40.6%) and in the individual subgroups (50.5% to 45.5% black, 42.4% to 37.4% multiracial, 42.9% to 37.9% students with disabilities, and 44.2% to 39.2% ELL students) for chronically absent students.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through monthly attendance response meetings to focus on engagement opportunities and community supports to promote school attendance and weekly analyzation of attendance data to monitor individual student attendance to become more preventative when a trend is noticed with students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilizing the PBIS framework will support creating a positive environment at school to where students want to be at school and utilizing positive reinforcers for our students who have attendance issues.

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

Through the research of Dr. Karen Mapp, family engagement at the school including two-way communication and partnerships has been shown to increase student attendance and therefore increase student academic achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set up monthly attendance response committee meetings focused on building partnerships and engagement with our families plus increasing community support to get our families to school.

Person Responsible: Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 - meetings begin

Weekly data report analyzation with the school counselors, family engagement liaison, and administrative team to focus on identify trends and students verging on being chronically absent and to provide interventions and supports for the student to attend school.

Person Responsible: Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Advisory Council meets with the school principal to review over the Title 1 Budget to ensure that the Areas of Focus are supported through all purchases made with the Title 1 Funding to meet the needs of the school. Feedback and determination is made through analyzation of the school data and the determined priorities to support the students at the school in attendance, behavior, and academics.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is disseminated on the school webpage (https://www.marionschools.net/fkm), presented in School Advisory Council meetings, shared through school wide mass messaging, and reviewed over with parents at different family engagement events. The School Improvement Plan is also available in print through request at the front office.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Parent Family Engagement Plan is posted on the school website (https://www.marionschools.net/fkm) and available in print in the front office by request. The school communicates regularly through

different forms of communication such as email and phone call and posts pertinent information to the school Facebook page. The ongoing communication and the family engagement activities align with the school's Areas of Focus and increasing the family knowledge and practices to support at home.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Fort King Middle School is providing ongoing professional learning to staff throughout the school year focused on classroom management, being culturally responsive, incorporating Universal Design classroom strategies, ELL supports, best practices for communication and engagement with families, and planning to the depth of the standard. Fort King is also providing after school tutoring to support students who struggle with learning the standards and need extra time to further build towards mastery. Algebra students also have after school tutoring to further support earning high school credits in middle school and to pass the state end of course exam at the end of the year.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Fort King Middle School is focused on utilizing outside resources to further support our students in the prevention of violence, workforce preparation, and nutritional practices. The Marion Children's Alliance SKIP program meets individually and in small groups with students to discuss many topics around violence prevention. Kut Different individually mentors students as a form of violence prevention. Fort King's Career and Technical Education program provides opportunities for students to become prepared for high school courses and careers in agriculture, health occupations, robotics and engineering, and technology.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No