

Santa Rosa County School District

Martin Luther King Middle School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Martin Luther King Middle School

5928 STEWART ST, Milton, FL 32570

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

Demographics

Principal: Darren Brock

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Santa Rosa County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To make our Cougars "King of the Hill" in reading, writing, math, science, technology, and positive attitudes.

Provide the school's vision statement

To motivate students to reach their potential through a joint effort of school resources, family support, and community involvement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Brock, Darren Principal	Principal
McCormick, Margaret Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Lee, Kelly Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Adams, Allison Teacher, ESE	Teacher, ESE
Byers, Jamie Dean	Dean
Guy, Theresa Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach
Marshall, Elizabeth Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	214	225	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	40	39	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	19	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	9	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	107	134	0	0	0	0	316

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	113	128	0	0	0	0	329

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	39	40	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	13	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	51	45	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	107	136	0	0	0	0	322

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	119	125	0	0	0	0	335

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	63%	54%	41%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	60%	54%	40%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	56%	47%	41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	47%	70%	58%	53%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	42%	65%	57%	48%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	58%	51%	47%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	63%	51%	56%	67%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	77%	72%	68%	77%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	217 (0)	214 (0)	225 (0)	656 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	36 ()	40 ()	39 ()	115 (0)
One or more suspensions	11 (0)	20 (0)	19 (0)	50 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	11 (0)	14 (0)	9 (0)	34 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	75 (0)	107 (0)	134 (0)	316 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
	2018	35%	60%	-25%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	59%	-18%	52%	-11%
	2018	30%	56%	-26%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	44%	68%	-24%	56%	-12%
	2018	56%	71%	-15%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	46%	66%	-20%	55%	-9%
	2018	45%	63%	-18%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	54%	-23%	54%	-23%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	54%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2019	45%	76%	-31%	46%	-1%
	2018	56%	77%	-21%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	62%	-20%	48%	-6%
	2018	54%	66%	-12%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	75%	-13%	71%	-9%
2018	68%	75%	-7%	71%	-3%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	73%	2%	61%	14%
2018	73%	67%	6%	62%	11%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	65%	-65%	56%	-56%

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	44	43	26	33	23	38	29	40		
BLK	15	37	43	19	30	34	14	38			
HSP	38	52		42	43			40			
MUL	52	54	64	48	41	27	43	61	57		
WHT	48	54	53	49	44	39	48	65	58		
FRL	41	52	55	45	42	39	44	58	59		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	32	29	31	45	41	45	43	18		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
BLK	32	36	25	34	41	32	50	44			
HSP	36	38		52	55						
MUL	51	42	64	55	47	39	55	61	71		
WHT	41	41	42	55	49	49	59	70	62		
FRL	38	38	42	51	48	50	52	68	56		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
---	----

Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Seventh grade math showed the greatest decline (44%-31%) from the prior year. The contributing factor was that KMS had two teachers new to teaching 7th grade math, may not have been familiar with standards and/or test specifications. Also, all seventh grade students at KMS who scored in the top 25% on the 6th grade FSA in 2018 were assessed using the 8th grade FSA in 2019 which is in compliance with Santa Rosa County District guidelines.

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

Seventh grade math showed the greatest decline (44%-31%) from the prior year. The contributing factor was that KMS had two teachers new to teaching 7th grade math, may not have been familiar with standards and/or test specifications. Also, all seventh grade students at KMS who scored in the top 25% on the 6th grade FSA in 2018 were assessed using the 8th grade FSA in 2019 which is in compliance with Santa Rosa County District guidelines.

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

Seventh grade math data component showed a gap of 23% when compared to the state average. The contributing factor was that KMS had two teachers new to teaching 7th grade math, may not have been familiar with standards and/or test specifications. Also, all seventh grade students at KMS who scored in the top 25% on the 6th grade FSA in 2018 were assessed using the 8th grade FSA in 2019 which is in compliance with Santa Rosa County District guidelines.

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

In ELA 6th grade improved 11%, SWD increased 12% SWD lowest 25% grew 25%, African American subgroup improved 18%. KMS implemented more intensive data driven instruction in the 6th grade. KMS' new literacy coach identified the subgroups and provided strategies and support for direct instruction. In addition KMS added certified and highly qualified instructional support for students with disabilities.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

KMS greatest areas of concern are our subgroups of SWD and African American achievement in math and 8th grade ELA.

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

- 1.Math
- 2 .ELA
3. SWD
- 4.Parent Involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3	
Title	Students at King Middle School should be proficient in math
Rationale	In 2018-19 FSA math scores dropped considerably. In addition KMS students' achievement averaged 23% below the school district average. Math proficiency in middle school will also insure higher high school graduation rates, higher college admission rates, higher technical education rats, and allow students greater opportunities to enter the workforce with ease.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of all matched standard curriculum students who meet the attendance requirement will sow proficiency on the 209-2020 Mathematics Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students who were not proficient on the math FSA are in intensive math classes for one semester. These classes use progress monitoring data from STAR to identify standards where students demonstrate weaknesses. These identified areas become the targets of instruction individually.All math students will utilize elements of interactive notebooks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intensive students are in small classes where they can receive small group and direct instruction based on state MAFS.The interactive notebooks provide students of all learning styles access to the instruction and practice.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students in intensive math classes will use Edmentum's Exact Path for customized assignments for students to work at their own levels. 2. Students in all math classes will use Edmentum's Study Island to complete basic skills and content skills problem activities. 3.Students in all math classes need access to technology (computers, etc.) 4. Teachers will participate in a training at the beginning of the year and follow up trainings from the district math coordinator. 5. Teachers will participate in a STEAM PLC to develop and implement lessons that are practical real world applications. 6. Teachers will guide student practice with decoding math vocabulary through the use of interactive notebooks.
Person Responsible	Darren Brock (brockdc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#4

Title

Rationale

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#5	
Title	Students at King Middle School should be proficient in language arts.
Rationale	Acquiring language arts proficiency will afford our students an ease of transition through middle school and into high school. This proficiency will give an ease of transition from middle school to high school as well as insure higher high school graduation rates, higher college admission rates, higher technical education rates and allow student greater opportunities to enter the workforce with ease.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of all matched standard curriculum students who meet the attendance requirement will show proficiency on the 2019-2020 LAFS FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Margaret McCormick (mccormickm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Level I students on the ELA FSA are enrolled in intensive ELA classes. These classes use progress monitoring data from STAR to identify standards where students demonstrate weaknesses. These identified areas become the targets of instruction individually. Level II students are enrolled in Cooperative Reading Remediation classes co-taught with smaller student to teacher ratio and an ELA certified teacher and a reading endorsed teacher. All ELA classes use the district adopted curriculum which is evidenced based as well as interactive notebooks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intensive students are in small classes where they can receive small group and direct instruction based on state LAFS. The interactive notebooks provide students of all learning styles access to the instruction and practice.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All ELA, reading, social studies, and science classes will incorporate grade level appropriate complex text and incorporate inquiry based discussions.. 2. All social studies classes implement Document Based Questioning and write essays using these documents. 3. All teacher will be trained in inquiry based reading and discussion strategies and incorporating complex texts for individual students and in group settings. 4. Teachers will be trained on reading and text-dependent writing strategies that can incorporated into their content areas. ELA teachers will incorporate inquiry based reading strategies to enhance text-dependent questioning and writing. 5. The reading coach will provide vocabulary and comprehension stems for all teachers to incorporate into content-area reading tasks. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 5.
--------------------	---

Person Responsible Margaret McCormick (mccormickm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#6

Title

Rationale

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Two additional school-wide improvement priorities are the achievement of our Students with Disabilities and black students. Currently, KMS addresses their needs using the Resource Room, inclusion teachers push in ELA, math, social studies, and science classes (a majority of the content area teachers are dual certified in their content and ESE), learning strategies classes, Colloborative Reading Remediation classes, intensive ELA and math classes These strategies should boost the achievement of both students. This year all teachers will participate in professional development to improve differentiation of instruction, provided by FDLRS, PS/Rtl Project, and other available resources.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

King Middle School plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students by monthly parent and family involvement activities such as parent nights and family nights. Parents are welcomed to use the Parent Resource Room anytime during school hours. King

Middle School plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students by monthly parent and family involvement activities such as parent nights and family nights. Parents are welcomed to use the Parent Resource Room anytime during school hours. Our School Advisory Committee includes parents and community business leaders as members to discuss the school's performance and the needs of the students.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

King Middle School ensures the social-emotional needs of our students are being met by using Capturing Kids Hearts which is a research based program focusing on creating a secure and accepting environment for the students. We also use CHAMPS on the campus which is research based as well. The Certified School Counselor provides 5 hours of mental health lessons to each student through out the year using district created lessons. On campus weekly we have a Military Family Counselor (MFLAC) who works with the military family students. There is a CDAC counselor on campus daily conducting group and individual counseling to those students in need of more services. Assemblies and small group lessons are taught on internet safety and cyber bullying, the dangers of drugs and alcohol, dating violence, suicide awareness, and other topics as needed.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Administrators from elementary feeder schools and KMS administrators meet in the summer prior to the new school year to discuss academic, behavior, and attendance of incoming cohorts of students. Discussion is focused primarily on the At-Risk students needs and interventions that have or have not been successful. Likewise, our administrators meet with Milton High administrators to discuss academic, behavior, and attendance of outgoing cohort of students focusing again on At-Risk students. During preplanning sixth grade teachers meet with one of our administrators to discuss the information shared about the At-Risk students. Afterwards, sixth grade teachers meet monthly as part of MTSS to discuss students struggling academically, behaviorally, and truancy and identify interventions for each student..

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The school leadership at King Middle School identifies and aligns the resources available to the school according to district, state, and federal guidelines. The leadership team of the school consists of department heads, the reading coach, the academic intervention specialist (AIS), dean, guidance counselor, assistant principal and principal. The needs of the students are analyzed by the leadership team and plans put in place to meet the needs of the students. Testing data is closely analyzed for areas of need as well as areas of

growth. The teachers write personal improvement plans, called My Learning Plan, specific to their areas of need and the needs of the students' they teach. The administration of King Middle School actively seeks in-service and training to provide the teachers and staff the most up to date and relevant topics specific to the needs of our students and subgroups (such as SWD, black students, dealing with poverty, trauma). All curriculum is district approved and supplemental aids are research based. All textbooks and supplemental supplies are inventoried by the Assistant Principal and maintained appropriately. The School Advisory Council meets on the second Tuesday of each month to problem-solve areas of need and discuss improvements and accomplishments of students. The SAC also reviews, makes improvements and approves SIP, budgets, Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and School Compact. Parents and community members are always welcome to attend the SAC meetings and there is a public forum section of each meeting. Overseen by the AP and Principal, the AIS records and maintains all Title 1 documents. The budget and funds are strictly maintained by the school bookkeeper who is audited regularly by the district and state.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

King Middle School has both veteran and new teachers participating in STEAM professional development PLCs to provide real-world application of academic studies. Whiting Field Naval Air Station provides mentors for students at the school. The Cafeteria Chats are opportunities for guest speakers in various fields to share personal experiences and career choices with students. KMS offers manufacturing, technology, culinary, and DIT classes where students can earn certifications in those specialized areas. Social Studies classes for eighth grade incorporate career planning as part of the curriculum. Local area businesses donate materials, food, and other resources to the school throughout the academic year. KMS sponsors Robotics Team, Math Team, and Genius club to provide students with the opportunity to research and participate in activities leading to career choices.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students at King Middle School should be proficient in math	\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students at King Middle School should be proficient in language arts.	\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00