

Manatee County Public Schools

Martha B. King Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Martha B. King Middle School

600 75TH ST NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

<https://www.manateeschools.net/king>

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.

The mission of Martha B. King Middle School is to prepare the King community for the challenge and global demands of the 21st century by facilitating the acquisition of knowledge, skills and experiences necessary to reach individual potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Mullen, Michael	Principal	
Clark, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Spahn, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Edelkind, Shane	Teacher, K-12	
Sperduto, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Takacs, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
McKillip, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Myers, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Nesser, Damian	School Counselor	
Garrity, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	
Evans, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Nelson, Erica	Dean	
Koshinski, Craig	Dean	

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 leadership team (also known as the Instructional Leadership Team, ILT) meets on a monthly basis, seeking input and problem solving for each department and school's academic focus. The ILT meets on a monthly basis with their departments in efforts to provide communication and to problem solve the school's academic goals, as well as reflect upon students' needs. The school's grade categories and goals are discussed.

-The ILT is comprised of the departments chairs from each academic department, so that the department chairs are advocates for the school's vision and problem solvers for their academic needs. Each teacher is involved in this process, and meets on a monthly basis. The school's grade categories and goals are discussed.

-The School Safe and Learning Environment committee is comprised of administrators, counselors, deans, school resource officer, teacher(s), and parent(s) when possible. This committee meets as needed to develop or review the school center crises plan and to minimize disruptive behaviors at school, with a minimum of 2 times a year. The school's goals and behavior targets are discussed.

-Parents are offered the FOCUS Parent portal, Facebook communication, mass phone calls and email messaging from administration, and the Parent Advisory group. Parents are encouraged to join the Parent Advisory group at any time. The Parent Advisory leaders meet with administration on an as needed basis for input and support. The school's goals and behavior targets are discussed.

-Community leaders are asked to support the school through the district website, school's Facebook, and by word of mouth. Many of our community leaders have also joined our Parent Advisory group. The school's goals and behavior targets are discussed.

-The SAC (School Advisory Committee) also meets quarterly to communicate or revise the school's goals. The SAC is comprised of a sample of the stakeholders: admin, teachers, parents, student(s) when possible. The school's grade categories and goals are discussed.

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 is monitored using progress monitoring data on a quarterly basis and the plan is revised as needed, or the school addresses gaps as needed through the ILT on a monthly basis.

-For ELA, this is quarterly through FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 and quarterly through Write Score assessments.

-For ELA L25 students, this is weekly through Lexia Power Up reading program.

-For Math 6-8, this is quarterly through FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3.

-For Math L25 students, this is through Dream Box math review program.

-For Algebra 1 and Geometry, this is quarterly through district quarterly benchmarks.

-For Science, this is quarterly through Progress Learning science program.

-For Civics, this is quarterly through district quarterly benchmarks.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	TSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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	95	128	120	343	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	124	89	309	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	40	14	58	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	38	18	77	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	151	129	382	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	114	88	276	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	153	144	415	

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	115	168	126	409

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	2	12	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	43	53	57	153	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	12	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	70	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	50	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	110	108	286	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	101	83	257	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	20	34	84	

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	40	50	50	140

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43	53	57	153	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	12	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	70	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	50	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	110	108	286	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	101	83	257	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	20	34	84	

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	40	50	50	140

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	38	47	49	35	49	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				38			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			31		
Math Achievement*	56	61	56	51	35	36	49		
Math Learning Gains				57			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			39		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	42	48	49	29	57	53	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	70	68	64	54	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	94	81	73	89	47	49	74		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	57	34	40	52	79	76	52		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	3
ELL	28	Yes	4	2
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	16	Yes	4	2
HSP	50			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	51			

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	28	Yes	3	2
ELL	31	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	22	Yes	3	1
HSP	44			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	44			

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	38			56			42	66	94			57
SWD	9			25			5	26			4	
ELL	8			29			7	39			5	57
AMI												
ASN	70			70							2	
BLK	14			25			6	18			4	
HSP	21			41			28	57	95		6	59
MUL	40			62			43	79			4	
PAC												
WHT	60			78			63	83	94		5	
FRL	28			44			31	58	90		6	55

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	35	38	31	51	57	47	29	64	89			52
SWD	10	26	28	20	36	36	15	28				50
ELL	11	29	29	29	41	44	5	42				52
AMI												
ASN	67	27		67	75							
BLK	4	23	29	12	33	34	4	37				
HSP	27	35	28	44	52	46	19	58	80			55
MUL	30	29		53	51		42	69				
PAC												
WHT	55	48	40	73	69	67	51	84	93			
FRL	24	34	30	41	52	47	21	57	84			51

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	40	43	31	49	48	39	37	64	74			52
SWD	14	21	18	19	30	30	19	36				30
ELL	21	32	27	30	43	50	16	50	53			52

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

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	32%	43%	-11%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	45%	-10%	47%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	41%	45%	-4%	47%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	32%	41%	-9%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	45%	-5%	44%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	69%	-3%	66%	0%

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.

King Middle's lowest performing area was ELA Achievement at 38% proficiency. We have noticed a mid 30s range for the past 3 years. We did increase this area from 35% (2022) to 38% (2023) proficiency.

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

King Middle did not have any areas of school grade that declined in 2023.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 7th grade ELA Reading at 33% proficiency compared to the state at 47% proficiency. The next lowest area was 8th grade ELA Reading at 34% proficiency compared to the state at 47% proficiency. 6th grade ELA Reading was 41% proficiency compared to the state at 47% proficiency. The primary factor contributing to the gap when compared to the state average is the trend of more students with lower English proficiency over the past 3-5 years.

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 8th grade science which increased 12%, from 28% proficient to 42% proficient. We attribute this to a change in teachers and focusing on standards.

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

A potential area of concern is the number of students that are not proficient in reading. This is one of our primary barriers. Our next primary area of concern is the students that are not proficient in math.

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

1. Increased literacy across the school to impact ELA proficiency, ELA learning gains, and ELA L25 learning gains.
2. Increased classroom engagement.
3. Increased classroom management plan structures.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

ELA achievement score was below average last year at 38%. Our students are not meeting their requirements for high school graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the current school year, ELA achievement will increase from 38% to 40% proficiency. By the end of the current school year, 42% of students will make gains in ELA. By the end of the current school year, 38% of our L25 students will make gains in ELA. All of these will be measured by the state assessment at the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

ELA achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth towards proficiency as indicated by FAST ELA progress monitoring, Lexia reading program, Write Score writing program, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

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.)

Interventions used for focused growth are teacher collaboration guided by instructional leadership team and admin as needed, PD on BEST standards, individual student check-ins such as data chats, and student tutoring opportunities. All teachers are completing a school wide vocabulary word of the day along with writing in every course each day to increase literacy knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

- August 2023: PD on best standards, specifically on the new writing rubrics
- August 2023: PD on focused note-taking for all teachers to implement daily
- August 2023: PD on daily writing in each course. Teachers will read and writing within their content area.
- Monthly throughout school year: ILT members will bring back data school wide strategies to content area

teachers to implement, as well as seek feedback on schoolwide literacy focus, engagement, classroom management structure, and focused note-taking.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

By When: FAST Reading PM3 state assessment date

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Math Achievement proficiency score is a critical area due to the math skills needed for graduation. It was 58% last year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the current school year, Math achievement will increase from 58% to 60% proficiency. By the end of the current school year, 57% of students will make gains in Math. By the end of the current school year, 50% of our L25 students will make gains in Math. All of these will be measured by the state assessment at the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Math achievement will be monitored by admin, teachers, and individual students for growth towards proficiency as indicated by FAST Math progress monitoring, Dream Box math program, Acaletics monthly math diagnosis, district benchmarks, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based 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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

- August 2023: PD on best standards, specifically on the new BEST standards
- August 2023: PD on focused note-taking for all teachers to implement daily
- August 2023: PD on daily writing in each course. Teachers will read and writing within their content area, increasing engagement.
- Monthly throughout school year: ILT members will bring back data school wide strategies to content area

teachers to implement, as well as seek feedback on schoolwide literacy focus, engagement, classroom management structure, and focused note-taking.

Person Responsible: Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

By When: FAST Math PM3 state assessment date

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

8th grade Science Achievement score was below average at 42%, and was therefore identified as a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the current school year, 8th grade Science Achievement score will maintain our growth of 42% proficiency achievement, which was a 14% growth from last year.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based 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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

- August 2023: PD on focused note-taking for all teachers to implement daily
- August 2023: PD on daily writing in each course. Teachers will read and writing within their content area.
- Monthly throughout school year: ILT members will bring back data school wide strategies to content area teachers to implement, as well as seek feedback on schoolwide literacy focus, engagement, classroom management structure, and focused note-taking.

Person Responsible: Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

By When: State Science Assessment date

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Civics Achievement score was 66% last year. This was considered a success, with a new teacher assisting in the success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the current school year, Civics Achievement will increase from 66% to 67% as measured by the end of year state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based 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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

-August 2023: PD on focused note-taking for all teachers to implement daily

-August 2023: PD on daily writing in each course. Teachers will read and writing within their content area.

-Monthly throughout school year: ILT members will bring back data school wide strategies to content area teachers to implement, as well as seek feedback on schoolwide literacy focus, engagement, classroom management structure, and focused note-taking.

Person Responsible: Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

By When: Civics EOC state assessment date

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based 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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

- Progress Monitor progress reports and report cards
- Provide opportunities for lunch time help, before school help or after school help
- Ensure IEPs, 504s, and Educational Plans are being followed in the classroom and during assessment times
- Hold parent teacher conferences as needed for nonperforming students
- Provide check in/check out adults for students as needed

Person Responsible: Michelle Clark (clark3m@manateeschools.net)

By When: -Monitor grades monthly -Parent teacher conferences, as needed -Accommodations followed continuously -Check in/check out students monitored weekly

#6. 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.

King Middle is building a cohesive culture and learning environment to target positive classroom management, increased literacy knowledge, and active student engagement that is consistent for students across all school courses. King is in the first year of candidacy phase for the IB MYP program. The Learner Profile attributes will be modeled throughout the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, we will decrease suspension by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

The suspension data will be monitored on a quarterly basis by the school deans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

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.)

All classrooms will utilize a CHAMPS format for a positive classroom management system. In addition, the engagement in the classroom will be increased by a teachers utilizing a focused note taking strategies in all courses, therefore decreasing off tasks behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive classroom management interactions is an evidenced based strategy for improvement of school culture. Increased engagement is also an evidence based strategy.

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.

- Progress Monitor referral data
- Reward students for GPA, academic achievement, and behavior using a Renaissance format
- Reward students quarterly who have been identified for behavior contracts

Person Responsible: Jason Spahn (spahnj@manateeschools.net)

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)).

King Middle School is identified as ATSI for subgroups with a Federal index below 41% in the areas of Students with Disabilities at 28%, English Language Learners at 31%, and Black/African American students at 22%. The school improvement funding allocations and resources will be reviewed at ILT monthly meetings, department monthly meetings, and within each specific leader area. The ESE Department Chair will monitor SWD resources every formal grading period, such as progress reports and report card period. The ESOL Lead Teacher will monitor ELL resources every formal grading period, such as progress reports and report card period. The Deans and Counselors will monitor Black/African American student progress and resources every formal grading period, such as progress reports and report card period. Interventions such as weekly prizes, daily check-in/check-outs, parent meetings, and goal setting will be provided.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

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

N/A

Rationale:

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

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

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
6	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