Martin Luther King Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Martin Luther King Middle School

5928 STEWART ST, Milton, FL 32570

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/kms/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

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.

To love, educate, and prepare all students for graduation and a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Santa Rosa County District Schools provides an environment that fosters each learner's potential, equips students for academic excellence, and promotes lifelong learning.

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
Brock, Darren	Principal	Provides strategic direction for the school by developing curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent involvement, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff and overseeing facilities.
Baxley, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal to provide direction for the school by developing curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring students achievement, encouraging parent involvement, administering the budget, hiring, and evaluating staff and overseeing facilities.
Lee, Kelly	School Counselor	Is responsible for the registration of new students and scheduling of all students, provides personal/social, behavioral, and/or academic counseling to all students, provides assistance in the screening, referral, identification and placement of students with special needs, and provides assistance to parents of all students. Coordinates and administers a variety of standardized tests, maintains test security, and interprets test results to parents, students, and other school staff.
Briggs, Leslie	Reading Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing literacy professional development, to build capacity with literacy community for improving student achievement, to collaborate among teams (School Leadership team, Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS, etc.), to determine literacy needs and implement success strategies at school site.
Lyle, Lisa	Math Coach	Provides teacher professional learning for mathematics and small group mathematics intervention.
Guy, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Provides teacher professional learning for literacy and small group literacy intervention.
Renfro, Lawrence	Dean	Manages student supervision issues and enforces school behavioral expectations. Is knowledgeable of Santa Rosa County School Board Policies regarding safety and discipline, enforces policies/rules both fairly and consistently. Promotes the welfare of students, faculty and staff; and sets high expectations and articulates them to all stakeholders.

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.

Data will be shared with teachers and staff during pre-planning week. Parents and stakeholders will be given data through student orientation and school advisory council. All stakeholders will be given opportunity to input in the SIP development through an online forms document using QR code.

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))

School leadership team will regularly monitor the SIP quarterly for effective implementation and provide support and feedback to teachers that directly impact an increase in student achievement. Content coaches will be present in common planning to support the development of intentional instruction that is aligned with state standards. Administration will walk classrooms in all grade levels bi-weekly to monitor delivery of instruction. The school will revise the plan after meeting quarterly to ensure continuous improvement.

Each semester the Principal and assistant principal will meet with District leaders to include the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Grade Level Director, Literacy/Math/Science Coordinators and the Director and Coordinator of Continuous Improvement. The purpose of the meeting will be to review current state progress monitoring data and to progress monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Strategies and Action Steps. Specific feedback will be provided and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the strategies of 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	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	70%
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)* 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: C

	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	55	45	54	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	51	46	120
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	7	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	75	81	220
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	59	68	185
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	41	55	57	153

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	0	9	10	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	12

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	25	40	46	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	3	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	65	65	185
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	86	70	222
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	59	56	166

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	20	25	26	71

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	10	4	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	13

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	25	40	46	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	3	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	65	65	185
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	86	70	222
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	59	56	166

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	41	55	57	153

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	10	4	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	13

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*	42	58	49	40	59	50	41		
ELA Learning Gains				41			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			34		
Math Achievement*	40	68	56	41	38	36	38		
Math Learning Gains				48			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			39		
Science Achievement*	45	61	49	43	69	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	52	74	68	59	66	58	59		
Middle School Acceleration	80	68	73	50	54	49	47		
Graduation Rate					64	49			
College and Career Acceleration					79	70			
ELP Progress		75	40		64	76			

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	259
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
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	21	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	4	
HSP	33	Yes	2	
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	53			

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%
FRL	45			

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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	33	Yes	1	
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	42			40			45	52	80			
SWD	15			20			17	31			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			39			36	47			4	
HSP	33			32							2	
MUL	46			42			29	41	79		5	

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
PAC												
WHT	43			40			48	56	78		5	
FRL	38			33			35	47	72		5	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	40	41	37	41	48	36	43	59	50			
SWD	12	29	34	23	32	20	23	35				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	38	60	30	34	8	35	36				
HSP	23	43		26	38							
MUL	42	46	26	44	50	33	41	63	53			
PAC												
WHT	41	40	36	42	49	38	44	62	49			
FRL	33	37	37	33	43	36	37	53	43			

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	41	45	34	38	36	39	50	59	47			
SWD	14	32	30	17	38	44	22	41				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	53	37	20	37	41	20	46				
HSP	35	27		31	33							
MUL	36	38	24	43	41	36	50	65	58			
PAC												
WHT	43	46	36	39	34	38	55	60	44			
FRL	37	44	36	34	36	39	46	56	38			

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	37%	54%	-17%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	47%	-4%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	47%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	63%	-25%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	30%	48%	-18%	48%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	76%	-30%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	58%	34%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	71%	-18%	66%	-13%

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST result the lowest performance data component was math proficiency at 38%. The factors are teacher turnover and the lack of consistent rigorous instruction. The trends have shown an inconsistency in the data for the past 3 years.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST results the greatest decline from the prior year result was the Civics EOC with a drop in 6% proficiency. The factor that contributed to the decline in Civics EOC proficiency are teacher turnover and lack of consistent rigorous instruction.

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary raw data the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 7th grade math. The contributing factor is the 7th grade advance student take the 8th grade pre-algebra FAST assessment.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary raw data the most improvement component was Algebra 1 EOC with a 20 percent proficiency increase. The actions taken was explicit standards aligned instruction and Algebra 1 EOC and the after school boot camp offered.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data we have identified two potential areas of concerns are student attendance and number of Level 1 math students.

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

Our highest priority is students with disabilities, then followed by math proficiency, ELA proficiency, professional learning communities, and positive climate and culture.

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 Other

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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, King Middle School had at total of 1,399 office referrals, resulting in 337 in school suspensions and 238 out of school suspensions. With high discipline data, this has negatively impacted the academic success of students. Implementing a Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports and with Student Centered Classrooms through school wide incentives, classroom lessons, and small groups will help students develop academic, social, and self-management skills associated with improvement of student academic performance.

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

Short Term: Positive Behavior Intervention & Support system will help King Middle School reduce total amount of office referrals by 15% at mid-year and 30% at EOY. Reducing the number of office referrals will directly impact the amount of in school suspension and out of school suspension and will increase academic success.

Long Term: Positive Behavior Intervention & Support system will help King Middle School reduce total amount of office referrals by 50% at EOY. Reducing the number of office referrals will directly impact the amount of in school suspension and out of school suspension and will increase academic success.

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

The school leadership team will review discipline data monthly with staff members and PBIS team to provide support and feedback to teachers. Administration, Dean of Students, Guidance Counselor, and Success Coach will be present in common planning to support the development of good classroom management polices, and ensure teachers are establishing and maintaining effective relationships in a student centered classrooms. The school leadership team will meet monthly to review the trends, and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lawrence Renfro (renfrol@santarosa.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.)

In order to decrease the total number of office referrals, we will effectively implement Positive Behavior Intervention & Support systems to addressing behavior through the prevention-oriented structuring of research-based interventions and supports in a hierarchical and progressive manner for the purpose of improved behavioral and academic outcomes[1]. The Marzano Focused Model's Classroom domain: Conditions for Learning with emphasis on the element of establishing and maintaining effective relationships in a student-centered classroom when implemented properly raises student achievement and engagement, helps improve student behavior, and contributes to a growth mindset[2].

(1)https://www.pbisworld.com/faq/
(2)https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/
FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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

Explicit, student led academic teaming ensures students have the opportunity for increasing critical thinking skills, student engagement skills, and help improve student behavior (1).

(1)The Power of Student Teams by Toth and Sousa

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 3 - Promising 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.

PBIS team will meet monthly to implement positive rewards.

Person Responsible: Lawrence Renfro (renfrol@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Teacher will participate in AVID, Marzano, and Innovative Schools Summit professional development to implement strategies within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Yearly

Organize parent involvement activities and events that build parent capacity.

Person Responsible: Theresa Guy (guyt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

#2. 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 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.

2021-2022 Spring state assessment data results demonstrated the following proficiency percentages: ELA-11.9% and Math-22.3% for Students with Disabilities. 2022-2023 teacher attendance rate was 88%, averaging a 58% fill rate for substitute teachers. Essentially, teachers and paraprofessionals were pulled 42% of the time to cover classes. The inconsistent instruction interrupts the learning environment that also negatively impacts our Hispanics and African American students.

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

Short Term: Administration will meet individually with staff to discuss attendance and professional development attendance. District data will reflect a minimum of 93% average of employee attendance rate by the end of the year.

Long Term: Administration will meet individually with staff yearly to discuss attendance and professional development attendance. District data will reflect a minimum of 98% average of employee attendance rate by the end of the year.

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

Administration will monitor staff attendance and substitute fill rate through Absent Management and FOCUS system monthly. Administration will meet monthly to review trends and meet with individual teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.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.)

In order to increase employee attendance rate, we will effectively implement the following:
• Review the number of PD days by teacher and reduce out of school PD for teachers who are chronically absent.
• Follow the district policy on unpaid personal leave.
• Provide monthly incentive for being at work every day of each month.

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

The single most important factor in student achievement is the quality of the teacher. However, if the teacher isn't present, it has an impact on every student assigned to that teacher. Studies have shown that students are more likely to perform poorly on standardized tests when their teachers are frequently absent (1).

(1)The Impact of Teacher Absenteeism on Student Performance
http://www.gogreenva.org/the-impact-of-teacher-absenteeism-on-student-performance/

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Review the number of PD days by teacher and reduce out of school PD for teachers who are chronically absent.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Principal will monitor absent management monthly and look at trends regarding PD days by teacher.

Follow the district policy on unpaid personal leave.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Principal will monitor absent management by not approving unpaid leave and conferencing staff individually with staff members who are in unpaid leave status on a needed bases.

Providing an incentive for being at work every day each month.

Person Responsible: Melissa Baxley (baxleym@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Staff with zero absences within a month will be celebrated monthly with incentives.

#3. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST result the math proficiency was 38% and ELA proficiency 41%. Additionally, classroom walkthrough data reflected a need for an increase of teachers effectively aligning instruction to benchmarks. Benchmark-aligned instruction is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring, and improving expectations clearly defined in academic content standards which provide the basis of content instruction and assessment. Increase exposure to explicit, benchmark-aligned instruction and setting scales and rubrics that are align with state standards will improve learning outcomes for all students.

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

Short Term: Walkthrough data will increase to 70% at mid-year and 85% at the EOY in the area of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction and setting scales and rubrics that are align with state standards. King Middle School overall goal for FAST math proficiency of 43% and 47% for ELA proficiency.

Long Term: Walkthrough data will increase to 85% at mid-year and 100% at the EOY in the area of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction. FAST data will reflect a minimum of 62% of students proficient in all content areas by the end of the year.

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

The school leadership team will review lesson plans weekly to provide support and feedback to teachers. Content coaches will be present in common planning to support the development of explicit, intentional instruction that is aligned. The school leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels bi-weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction. The leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.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.)

In order to increase benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms, we will effectively implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model framework with "provides a methodology to support teacher growth as teachers make instructional shifts necessary to support students in rigorous, standards-based classrooms" (1). The model draws upon data from field research and validation studies, couples with findings from the extant literature on rigorous, standards-based instruction, and scales & rubrics (2).

(1) https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/10/MC06-14-FTEM-White-Paper-1-16-18-Digital-4.pdf
(2) https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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

Explicit, standards-aligned instruction ensures students have the opportunity to access the targeted grade level expectations. The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is supported by wide research and demonstrates significantly increased student growth scores (1). The model is comprised of four domains directly tied to student achievement, two, Standards-Based Planning and Standards-Based Instruction, explicitly align to the Area of Focus.

(1) https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/ FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Teachers will participate in PLC's to focus on scales & rubrics, strategies to build collaboration, critical thinking, communication, and creativity.

Person Responsible: Melissa Baxley (baxleym@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly

Students in intensive math and reading classes will use Progress Learning, IXL, iLit 45, and language live for customized, benchmark-aligned assignments for students to work at their own levels.

Person Responsible: Leslie Briggs (briggsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Students in all math and ELA classes will have access to technology (computers, etc.)

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

All students are offered the opportunity to participate in after school tutoring, Civics Camp, Algebra 1 Camp, Math Camp, and ELA Camp.

Person Responsible: Theresa Guy (guyt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Teacher will participate in AVID, Marzano, and Innovative Schools Summit professional development to implement in their classroom.

Person Responsible: Melissa Baxley (baxleym@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Yearly

Through collaboration with PLCs, teachers will create a scales & rubric for standards to use as a guide ensure students are able to identify what they should be learning. By implementing learning scales/rubric that are standards-based, students will receive high-rigorous instruction.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Yearly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST results for grade 6, the math proficiency was 38% and ELA proficiency 42%. Establishing Professional Learning Communities targeting instructional based strategies will increase learning outcomes in ELA and Math for 6th grade students.

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

Short Term: King Middle School overall PM2 goal for 6th Grade FAST math proficiency of 43% and 47% for ELA proficiency.

Long Term: King Middle School overall goal for 6th Grade FAST data will reflect a minimum of 62% of students proficient in Math and ELA content areas by the end of the year.

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

The administration will collaborate with the SRCSD Math and Science, Literacy Department, and Director OPL to facilitate a PLC (Professional Learning Community) for Math and English teachers that focuses on student led teams. Desired outcomes will be monitored through classroom observations, MTSS, Progress Monitoring, and data chats with Math and English teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.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.)

The evidence-based strategy that will be used to improve student ELA and Math proficiency is a Professional Learning Community that is designed to support teachers with learning and implementing student led teams. Student led academic teaming involves students organized into small, diverse teams with clear protocols for engaging in standard based academic team tasks, empowering students to reach higher levels of critical thinking (1). Additionally, students learn to resolve their own conflicts, coach each other through challenges, peer teach, and ultimately ensure that everyone on the team reaches the learning target (1).

(1)Learning Forward: Empowered Students Lead and Learn by Toth
https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/empowered-students-lead-and-learn.pdf

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

The Standards Assessment Inventory provided to teachers indicated a need for growth in Creating a Culture of Collaboration and Inquiry. Professional Learning Communities address this need for a "shared culture of excellence and collective responsibility for all learners". (1) The goal of this PLC is to empower teachers to create and implement student led teams. This evidence-based strategy is designed to support teachers with learning and implementing student led teams(2). As teachers implement the strategies from the PLC we will support changes and growth to encourage continuation throughout the year and subsequent years.

(1)Advancing Outcomes for All Learners: Standards for Professional Learning

www.learningforward.com

(2)The Effective Implementation of Professional Learning Communities https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1194725.pdf

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Book study on "The Power of Student Teams", by Toth and Sousa with all 6th Grade teachers.

Person Responsible: Melissa Baxley (baxleym@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: First Quarter

Implementation of PLCs in student led teams to impact teacher effectiveness and student achievement

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-Weekly

First year implementation will be with 15 instructional units including 6th grade teachers studying The Power of Student Teams.

Person Responsible: Melissa Baxley (baxleym@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Begin by the 1st nine weeks and end by 1st planning day.

Instructional empowerment will provide training for these teachers to ensure a successful implementation.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Training will take place on planning days throughout the school year.

Implementation will be monitored through administrative observation and walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

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).

Teachers will participate in professional development and professional learning communities throughout the year,
aligned to their goal statements emphasizing in student led teams and Marzano strategies. Academic Interventionist will meet regularly with admin to progress monitor data in order to identify students with most needs and recommend and implement strategies to help them succeed. Each month the principal and assistant principal will meet with the school leadership team and once a quarter with SAC committee. The purpose of the meeting will be to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are

allocated based on the school needs and emphasis on area(s) of Focus. Specific feedback will be provided and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the funds in the area(s) of Focus.

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.

School staff and parents/guardians jointly develop the plan. The plan is disseminated through school website at https://kms.santarosaschools.org/en-US, emailed through Classtag, and a paper copy will be distributed at the Title 1 Family Night.

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))

King Middle School plans on building positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholder by hosting family/community engagement night once a quarter which is located in our Family Engagement plan through the school website at https://kms.santarosaschools.org/en-US. All grade level teachers will participate in two MTSS meetings each quarter (one at mid-term, and one just after the end of a quarter). Mentors will meet with students every 3 weeks to progress check with each student on academic acceleration. All classroom teachers will be using Avid strategies for high expectations.

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)

King Middle School is laying the foundation for AVID with the use of high expectation through all curriculum. The mentoring program is designed to build strong relationships by following the student through their entire middle school career.

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))

n/a