

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Lakeland Montessori Middle School
800 PALMETTO ST E
Lakeland, FL 33801
863-608-3194

School Demographics

School Type Middle School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 27%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School Yes	Minority Rate 34%

School Grades History

2013-14 B	2012-13 A	2011-12 A	2010-11
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	10
Goals Summary	0
Goals Detail	0
Action Plan for Improvement	0
Part III: Coordination and Integration	0
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	0
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	0

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Lakeland Montessori Middle School

Principal

Heather Manrow

School Advisory Council chair

n/a

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
n/a	n/a

District-Level Information

District

Polk

Superintendent

Dr. Kathryn Leroy

Date of school board approval of SIP

Pending

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Heather Manrow		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 0	Years at Current School: 0
Credentials	M.Ed. Educational Leadership B.S. Biology FL Certified: Educational Leadership (all levels), Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (grades 5-9), Mathematics (grades 5-9), Biology (grades 9-12), American Montessori Society Administrator Credential	
Performance Record	Montessori Middle School 2011-12: School Grade: A Montessori Middle School 2012-13: School Grade: A	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers	3
# receiving effective rating or higher (not entered because basis is < 10)	
# Highly Qualified Teachers	67%
# certified in-field	2, 67%
# ESOL endorsed	0, 0%
# reading endorsed	0, 0%
# with advanced degrees	2, 67%
# National Board Certified	0, 0%
# first-year teachers	0, 0%
# with 1-5 years of experience	, 0%
# with 6-14 years of experience	3, 100%
# with 15 or more years of experience	, 0%

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Montessori Middle School invests a large amount of time and funding in the Montessori professional development of teachers. In addition, the school matches the pay scale of the Polk County School Board in order to provide competitive wages. The Principal is responsible for hiring and working directly with the teachers.

In addition:

1. Currently, all lead teachers receive extensive Montessori Middle School training by an AMS accredited institution.
2. Currently, all lead teachers are mentored by a Montessori Middle School curriculum specialist.
3. Currently, the school pays for all lead teachers to attend an annual Montessori conference in the state of Florida.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Dr. Elizabeth Coe is the founder of the Houston Montessori Center and the instructor of the American Montessori Society (AMS) credential program. Dr. Coe holds a B.S. in Elementary Education, M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction, and Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology and Adolescence. She also holds state teaching certificates in early childhood, elementary, and special education. She has AMS credentials in Early Childhood, Elementary I/II, and Secondary I/II (2.5-18 years). A practicing Montessori teacher for 35 years, Dr. Coe is currently also Principal of the School of the Woods middle and high school, Executive Director of the Houston Montessori Teacher Education Center, past-president of AMS, and a frequent presenter, consultant, and keynote speaker. She currently provides the school's teacher mentoring program and Montessori training for the school's lead teachers.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (Rti)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS Leadership Team (the Principal and lead teachers) will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet as needed to engage in the following activities:

- o Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level aligned with the Montessori philosophy and identify student's meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks.
- o Design feasible strategies and interventions aligned with the Montessori philosophy for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
- o Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- o Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
- o Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The team provides data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; setting clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitation of the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligning these with authentic Montessori processes and theory.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The team provides data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; setting clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitation of the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligning these with authentic Montessori processes and theory.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Currently, baseline data in math, science, and reading is gathered through Discovery Education. Writing baseline data is gathered through mock FCAT Writes assessments and scored using the FCAT rubric. Baseline data is used to implement targeted intervention strategies (cooperative plans, work plans, intensive math/reading strategies) and/or enrichment strategies (project-based learning, live-event learning) immediately.

Progress Monitoring data is also collected through student work samples, and discipline reports and will be used as resources to pinpoint students in need of interventions or enrichment.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Professional learning will be provided during the staff meetings throughout the year. The MTSS Overview will be provided in mid-August/September.

The MTSS Leadership Team will evaluate additional staff Professional Learning and parent needs during MTSS Leadership Team meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Heather Manrow	Principal

How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Team will meet with lead teachers to evaluate the Language Arts and Reading curriculum and review the most current progress monitoring data. They will make instructional recommendations to include both interventions as well as enrichment strategies for subgroups of students and individual students.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to implement effective reading in the content area strategies into the curriculum and to provide strategies to help our students be more proficient in identifying main idea and author's purpose in a variety of texts.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Language Arts in the Montessori middle classroom is easily the most integrated discipline in Montessori education. The concepts of language are necessarily required in all the other disciplines in order to obtain the information presented. Teacher-created study guides will incorporate a variety of texts and the teachers will offer the opportunity for students to choose from multiple reading strategies.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	93%	80%	No	94%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic				
White	92%	75%	No	93%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities				
Economically disadvantaged	82%	54%	No	83%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	17	31%	20%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	23	43%	0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	32	59%	25%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)		63%	25%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	11	48%	35%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	93%	73%	No	94%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic				
White	92%	69%	No	93%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities				
Economically disadvantaged	91%	54%	No	92%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	22	41%	25%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	15	28%	0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	38	70%	25%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)		79%	25%

Area 4: Science

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	2	9%	
Students who fail a mathematics course	1	4%	
Students who fail an English Language Arts course			
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			