

Broward County Public Schools

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy

591 NW 31ST AVE, Lauderhill, FL 33311

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mitsuca Moreau

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: F (30%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 Broward 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy

591 NW 31ST AVE, Lauderdale, FL 33311

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 91% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 100% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

We, the faculty and staff of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy, have a commitment to excellence. We believe that with the cooperation of students, parents, teachers, staff, administration, and the community, we are able to meet the needs of the whole child, allowing each child to reach their academic potential and be prepared to meet the challenges of a culturally diverse and rapidly changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate students to achieve their maximum potential through standards-based instruction within the Montessori Philosophy and to engage the entire school community in the pursuit of achieving reading proficiency in a nurturing, learner-focused environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Ashley, Briana | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Ashley plays a key role in laying out and enforcing the school's policies. Through coordination with the principal, she helps set goals and objectives for instruction, safety and security, and other operational tasks. She works in collaboration with faculty and staff to ensure the school's academic goals are met. She also gives constructive feedback that leads to teacher growth through the district's professional growth and evaluative model. |
| Facyson, Latoya | Instructional Coach | As the literacy coach, Mrs. Ballard's primary role is to oversee the literacy department, ensuring the daily delivery of English/Language Arts meets the expectations set forth by administration. She monitors teaching and learning by visiting classrooms, analyzing student data, and engaging in the coaching cycle to improve teacher pedagogy. |
| Moreau, Mitshuca | Principal | Ms. Moreau oversees the day-to-day school operations. She manages school logistics and budgets. In addition to school operations, Ms. Moreau collaborates with the assistant principal to set learning goals for students that will be measured by the statewide assessment. Ms. Moreau also monitors and provide feedback to teachers regarding their performance to promote professional growth. As an instructional leader, Ms. Moreau analyzes student and teacher data to make informed decisions about curriculum and instruction. |
| Richards, Alicia | Instructional Coach | As the math coach, Ms. Richards' primary role is to oversee the math instruction, ensuring the daily delivery of meets the expectations set forth by administration. She monitors teaching and learning by visiting classrooms, analyzing student data, and engaging in the coaching cycle to improve teacher pedagogy. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/17/2015, Mitshuca Moreau

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

500

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 65 | 70 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 49 | 37 | 40 | 33 | 26 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 3 | 11 | 27 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |

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 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

2020-21 - 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 33% | 59% | 57% | 27% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 60% | 58% | 35% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 64% | 54% | 53% | 34% | 51% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 49% | 65% | 63% | 50% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 54% | 66% | 62% | 78% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 53% | 51% | 79% | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 16% | 46% | 53% | 11% | 49% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 60% | -30% | 58% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 62% | -19% | 58% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 26% | 59% | -33% | 56% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 65% | -9% | 62% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 67% | -14% | 64% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -56% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 64% | -27% | 60% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 13% | 49% | -36% | 53% | -40% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready diagnostics are administered to students in grades kindergarten - fifth three times a year to monitor progress in English/Language Arts and mathematics.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 25 | 18 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 19 | 12 | 30 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 18 | 21 | 27 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 15 | 17 | 19 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23 | 30 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 15 | 21 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 15 | 19 | 24 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14 | 25 | 41 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 25 | 22 | 32 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 24 | 24 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | N/A | 15 | 16 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 7 | | | 13 | 10 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | | | 47 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 40 | 50 | 36 | 27 | 18 | 19 | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 44 | | 38 | 27 | | 23 | | | | |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 23 | | | 26 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 44 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 57 | 63 | 49 | 54 | 48 | 16 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 59 | 64 | 50 | 55 | 48 | 16 | | | | |
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 21 | 27 | | 37 | 82 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 9 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 34 | 36 | 48 | 76 | 79 | 8 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 34 | 34 | 49 | 78 | 79 | 9 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 31 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 31 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 248 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 10 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 31 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |

| White Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 32 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trend that emerges across grade levels is the lack of reading proficiency. This lack of reading proficiency impacts all content areas especially science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our ELA data component score is 33% overall. This demonstrate the greatest need for improvement because our combined literacy score rates Dr. MLK in the Lowest 300 Schools category.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors continue to be teacher efficacy in the area of teaching reading to struggling learners. New action steps that are taken to improve is proving teachers continuous professional development in ELA. Specifically, teachers are working on their reading endorsement and taking PD with the Elementary Learning Department.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Lowest 25% scored 64% in Learning Gains and 58% of learning gains in ELA overall.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We continue to grow in this area to improve contributing factors. Instructional support personnel spend a lot of time in teachers' classrooms to support ELA and/or work directly with small groups of students in the lowest quartile.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue to progress monitor what we expect, i.e., small group reading instruction and materials to be used to support teachers being able to scaffold learning for students. We will also continue to monitor how effectively teachers work together. This will help with collective support and grade level improvements.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers meet with the instructional coaches weekly to front load upcoming standards, to learning strategies to best run effective small group instruction, to maximize learning during independent work by ensuring students working on standard based work and that it is differentiated.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teachers are continuously engaged in professional learning communities that supports students through data driven instruction. They also engage in book study such as Teach Like a Champion and using various techniques from the 62 that the book offers. This study has been ongoing and has improved ELA data components

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The goal is to have 50 percent of students scoring proficient on the statewide assessment has not been met. Trends show that there is still a need to close learning gaps in ELA for students in grades kindergarten to fifth.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 50% of students in grades 3 - 5 students will score a level 3 or higher as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in English/Language Arts.

Monitoring: School leaders will monitor student progress in grades 3 - 5 with monthly common formative assessments. Data will be analyzed and decisions will be made to ensure students are making progress towards the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mitshuca Moreau (mitshuca.moreau@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers in grades 3 -5 will participate in teacher-led professional learning communities (PLCs) that are driven by student data and teacher needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that PLCs are effective in improving instructional practices and teacher pedagogy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure that the PLC's are aligned to a problem of practice.
2. Teachers will engage in collaborative discussions that lead to analyzing student samples, sharing best practices and implementing some of the practices within their day-to-day instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Briana Ashley (briana.mccutcheon@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Dr. MLK ranked #1,166 among all other elementary schools in the state of Florida. According to the report, the ranking falls in the very high category. Our primary focus would be violent incidents as we are ranked 1,153 out of 1,395. The secondary area of concern is our suspension rates as they have increased over the last year. The school is adopting a schoolwide positive behavior tool that will decrease student infractions. Teachers and staff will be trained in the tool to promote a systemic change. There are a number of clubs and organizations that students will be able to participate in, hoping to also decrease unwanted student behavior. These two changes will hopefully positively impact our two areas of focus as it pertains to behavior and discipline data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our top priority at Dr. MLK is to ensure that teaching and learning is taking place each and every day. It is also our responsibility to ensure that the learning environment is welcoming, supportive and fun for our scholars, and the school culture and environment is positive and supportive to our staff. One thing that we do is celebrate our scholars through "Monthly Academic Parties." Teachers are celebrated on a monthly basis as well and are provided a small gift of appreciation that ranges from sweet treats, breakfast, lunch, etc. Another thing that we do to establish a positive school culture is model the behavior that we want to see. Changes must start from the top and when we interact with staff members and students we are being the example of the behavior that we want to see within the school.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We have a support system through our stakeholders; Grandparent Reading Pals program for K/1 students; High Dosage Tutoring program; and PTA. These groups promote student and staff activities and incentive programs. They volunteer to fund student incentive parties and milestones in learning.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|--|----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$22,655.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 1611 - Dr.Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy | Other Federal | 412.0 | \$14,000.00 |
| | | | 1611 - Dr.Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy | Other Federal | 412.0 | \$8,655.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Promethean Boards to enhance classroom instruction</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$22,655.00 |