

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Martin Luther King Elementary School  
591 NW 31ST AVE  
Lauderhill, FL 33311  
754-322-6550

### School Demographics

<b>School Type</b> Elementary School	<b>Title I</b> Yes	<b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b> 99%
<b>Alternative/ESE Center</b> No	<b>Charter School</b> No	<b>Minority Rate</b> 99%

### School Grades History

<b>2013-14</b> F	<b>2012-13</b> F	<b>2011-12</b> D	<b>2010-11</b> C	<b>2009-10</b> D
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

### 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>30</b>

---

## 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
Focus Year 3 or more	5	Gayle Sitter

  

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

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

Martin Luther King Elementary

##### Principal

Cheryl Proctor

##### School Advisory Council chair

Lavina Robinson

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

Name	Title
Cheryl Proctor	Principal
Derrick Huff	Assistant Principal
Lavina Robinson	Reading Coach
Jennifer Prievo	Math Coach
John Hoolihan	Science Coach
Tamar Bedward	Guidance Counselor
James Davis	Behavior Specialist

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Broward

##### Superintendent

Mr. Robert Runcie

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

2/19/2014

### School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

#### Membership of the SAC

Lavina Robinson: SAC Chair, teacher  
 Jennifer Prievo: SAC Secretary, teacher  
 John Hoolihan: Teacher  
 Tamar Bedward: Teacher  
 Keysia Rolle: Teacher  
 Aneatra King: Community Partner  
 Idella Johnson: Business Partner  
 Kelvin Louis: Business Partner  
 Cheryl Proctor: Principal  
 Fred Lovell: Community Partner

Teresa Kelley: Community Partner  
Tanya Ivy: Community Partner  
Shirley Sibert: Parent  
Ellen Reid: Parent  
Sharon Eady: Parent  
Cynthia Anderson: BTU Steward

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

SAC is part of the process for developing and writing the SIP, but not the sole agent. The SAC is the approving agent at the school level. The primary role of SAC is to assist in the development of the SIP and to monitor the implementation of the SIP. The SAC meets monthly to hear subcommittee reports and make decisions as to whether modifications need to be made. If revisions are made to the SIP strategies or the SIP budget, they need to be discussed and noted in the minutes.

**Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

The SAC will meet monthly to review the School Improvement Plan. Subcommittees will collaborate at SAC meetings to review data and make adjustments to identified areas in need of improvement. SAC members will collaborate monthly with the PTA to support student achievement.

**Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project**

Mega Skills

**Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC**

In Compliance

**If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements**

**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**

2

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

<b>Cheryl Proctor</b>		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 8	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Credentials</b>	School Principal (All Levels) Certification Educational Leadership Certification Ed.S. Educational Leadership M.S. Varying Exceptionalities B.S. Communication	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Banyan Elementary 2012-13: Letter grade of "B". Banyan Elementary 2011-12: Letter grade of "A". In 2012, 58% of students met high standards in reading and 65% of students met high standards in math, 71% made learning gains in reading and 75% made learning gains in math. Of our lowest 25% of students, 82% made learning gains in reading and 81% made learning gains in math. In science 41% met high standards and 77% in writing. Banyan Elementary 2010-2011: Letter grade of "A". In 2011, Banyan did not make AYP, 78% of student met high standards in reading and 71% of students met high standards in math. 65% made learning gains in reading and 61% made learning gains in math. Of our lowest 25% of students, 62% made learning gains in reading and 67% made learning gains in math. In science 43% met high standards and 83% in writing. In 2010,	

<b>Derrick Huff</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 1	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Credentials</b>	B.S. of Elementary Education M.Ed of Education 1-8 Ed.S. of Montessori Education Educational Leadership Certification ESOL Endorsement	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Virginia Shuman Young 2012-13: Grade A Virginia Shuman Young 2011-12 Grade A Virginia Shuman Young 2010-11: Grade A, AYP Met Reading Mastery 97%, Math Mastery 96%, Science Mastery 88%, Reading Learning Gains 74%, Math Learning Gains 78% Lowest 25%ile making Reading Gains 84%, Lowest 25%ile making math gains 84%	

**Instructional Coaches**

**# of instructional coaches**

3

**# receiving effective rating or higher**  
(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**

**Lavina Robinson**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 2

Years at Current School: 2

**Areas**

Reading/Literacy

**Credentials**

M.S. in Educational Leadership  
 B.S. in Psychology  
 ESOL Endorsement  
 Reading Endorsement  
 Educational Leadership Certification  
 Language Arts 5-9

**Performance Record**

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary 2012-13: Grade F, Reading Proficiency: 29%, Math Proficiency: 25%, Science Proficiency: 36%, Writing Proficiency: 52%, Reading Learning Gains: 51%, Math Learning Gains: 43%  
 Pine Ridge Education Center: 2011-2012 (No Rating): Reading Proficiency: 64%, Math Proficiency: 57%  
 Pine Ridge Education Center Grade: Declining 2010-2011  
 Reading Learning Gains: 50% Math Learning Gains: 64% Writing Proficiency: 94% Science Proficiency: 4%, AYP was not met

**John Hoolihan**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 1

Years at Current School: 1

**Areas**

Science

**Credentials**

B.S. in Elementary Education K-6  
 M.S. in Curriculum and Instruction  
 Ed.S. in Educational Leadership  
 ESOL Endorsement  
 Educational Leadership Certification

**Performance Record**

Hallendale Elementary 2012-13: Grade C, 52% proficient in Reading, 58% proficient in Math, 29% proficient in Science, 79% proficient in Writing  
 Hallendale Elementary 2011-12: Grade B, 54% proficient in Reading, 54% proficient in Math, 42% proficient in Science, 72% proficient in Writing  
 Hallendale Elementary 2010-11: Grade A, 52% proficient in Reading, 61% proficient in Math



<b>Jennifer Prievo</b>		
<b>Full-time / School-based</b>	<b>Years as Coach: 1</b>	<b>Years at Current School: 1</b>
<b>Areas</b>	Mathematics	
<b>Credentials</b>	M.S. in Educational Leadership M.S. in Curriculum and Instruction B.S. in Elementary Education K-6 ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement Educational Leadership Certification	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Tedder Elementary 2012-2013: Grade D, Reading Proficiency 29%, Math Proficiency 32%, Writing Proficiency 48%, Science Proficiency 42%, Learning gains in Reading 61%, Learning gains in Math 55% Tedder Elementary 2011-2012: Grade D, Reading Proficiency 34%, Math Proficiency 39%, Writing Proficiency 72% Tedder Elementary 2010-2011: Grade C Reading Proficiency 59%, Math Proficiency 58%, Writing Proficiency 73%, Science Proficiency 33%	

**Classroom Teachers**

<b># of classroom teachers</b>	33
<b># receiving effective rating or higher</b>	27, 82%
<b># Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	88%
<b># certified in-field</b>	24, 73%
<b># ESOL endorsed</b>	22, 67%
<b># reading endorsed</b>	5, 15%
<b># with advanced degrees</b>	12, 36%
<b># National Board Certified</b>	2, 6%
<b># first-year teachers</b>	2, 6%
<b># with 1-5 years of experience</b>	11, 33%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

10, 30%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

12, 36%

**Education Paraprofessionals****# of paraprofessionals**

7

**# Highly Qualified**

7, 100%

**Other Instructional Personnel****# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above****# receiving effective rating or higher****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**

When a position becomes available, administration will follow Broward County procedures and contractual policies to hire new staff members. Administration will conduct classroom observations and provide immediate feedback to improve teaching. Administrators will also have an open-door policy to ensure all teachers are being heard and supported. The IT at the school will update and maintain the school websites to recruit new teachers. Weekly team meetings will occur to support all teachers. Support staff members are assigned to the faculty as a resource. Coaches will support instruction in the classroom and provide professional development opportunities for the staff. The Common Core Teachers will support learning inside the classroom and work closely with teachers to effectively implement Common Core teaching. Professional Learning Communities will occur weekly as another support system provided to the staff. The NESS Liaison will be in place for all new teachers.

**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**

The NESS Liaison will coordinate the teacher mentoring program. The program will pair new teachers with a highly experienced educator to support the teacher throughout the year. The NESS Liaison will conduct monthly meetings with the new educators to help orient new teachers to the schools' procedures and provide support/mentoring in areas such as classroom management (class rules, routines, procedures, etc.), behavior management, and instructional delivery. Mentors will also attend monthly NESS support group meetings with their new educators.

New Educators: Mentors: Reason for Pairing:

Mr. Thelus (3rd grade) Mr. Hoolihan Previous 3rd grade experience, Science Coach

Ms. Simmons (ILT Teacher) Ms. Robinson Reading Coach

Ms. Sapp (2nd grade) Ms. Luna Primary Common Core Teacher  
 Ms. Murphy (4th grade) Ms. Prievo Math Coach, previous 4th grade teacher  
 Mr. Hood (Kindergarten) Mr. Louissaint Experienced Kindergarten Teacher

## 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**

All teachers participated in an MTSS training during pre-planning week. Additional trainings will be provided as needed. Each grade level has been assigned a support staff member to provide support and to monitor the implementation of the MTSS structure. Coaches will meet with grade level teams and reading intervention teachers to support planning, discuss data, and provide resources for teachers as well as students.

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

The Response to Intervention Leadership Team (RtI) or the MTSS Leadership Team utilize a diagnostic and prescriptive process. Tier interventions are routinely inspected in the areas of reading, mathematics, writing, science and behavior. Data collected through various Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. This formula is also used to screen at-risk students. All such students are referred to the MTSS team for consideration of how best to proceed. Following review and analysis of data, interventions are recommended for students who have been referred for academic, behavioral, emotional, and health related concerns. The case manager will follow up with teacher bi-weekly to ensure that interventions are taking place. Students are progress monitored weekly. The RtI/MTSS team usually of administration, psychologist, ESE specialist, behavior specialist, school psychologist, social worker, guidance counselor, reading coach, math coach, ESOL coordinator, and classroom teachers. Parents are also invited to attend. Members of the The RTI Leadership team meets 2 times monthly (more often if necessary) to discuss, data analysis, make program/instructional focus adjustments based on data analysis, determine progress of current programs and look to future programs. Support Staff meets bi-weekly with administration and Grade Chairs to act as liaison to administration for questions and concerns. Grade level teams meet weekly to develop small group support programs for students. MTSS Team Members: Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Science Coach, Speech/Language Pathologist, Guidance Counselor, and Area Office Personnel (School Psychologist & Social Worker)

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

Data chats, observations of MTSS meetings, and grade level team meeting minutes will be used to ensure that identified strategies, structures and programs are being implemented effectively and with fidelity.

### **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**

FAIR, Test Maker Pro for monthly school-wide assessments, District Benchmark Assessments, assessments from reading and math Intervention programs, and beginning, mid, and end of year

assessments will be used to determine the effectiveness of student support. Data will be stored and managed in an electronic database.

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

SAC meetings, MegaSkills trainings, PTA meetings and teacher/parent conferences provide opportunities for staff and parents to discuss data-based problem solving and identify goals and solutions.

### **Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### **Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:**

**Strategy:** Extended Day for All Students

**Minutes added to school year:** 10,800

Students will receive differentiated reading instruction for an additional 60 minutes per day. The reading instruction will consist of reading intervention for phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension. These targeted skill areas will be taught in conjunction with common core state standards.

#### **Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

#### **How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

Data will be collected using skill area assessments and monthly Test Maker Pro assessments. Monthly data chats and student portfolios will be used to determine the effectiveness of the strategy.

#### **Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

Administration and the reading coach are responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy.

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 5,850

Students will participate in an after school extended learning opportunity that will provide literacy, mathematics, and science instruction through interdisciplinary project-based learning. Common Core State Standards will be used to create data driven lessons and enrichment activities.

### Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

### How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Weekly performance assessments and FCAT Pro assessments will be used to determine the effectiveness of the strategy.

### Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Administration and instructional coaches will be responsible to monitoring the strategy.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Cheryl Proctor	Principal
Lavina Robinson	Reading Coach
Derrick Huff	Assistant Principal
Tamika Scott	5th grade teacher
Margaret Walden	3rd grade teacher
Wanda Huff	2nd grade teacher
Sandra DaCosta	KG teacher
Jennifer Prievo	Math Coach/ESOL coordinator
Mary Blackmon	2st grade teacher
Cathy Stubbs	4th grade teacher
John Hoolihan	Science Coach

### How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to collaborate ideas and review data analysis in order to successfully implement reading initiatives and interventions that will maximize student achievement and foster a love for reading in all our students. The principal and assistant principal promote a culture of reading throughout the school, monitor instructional fidelity, and provide feedback to teachers regarding their reading instruction. The reading coach provides reading assessment data and reports on grade level and school-wide trends to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses; the reading coach also provides or arranges for necessary professional development and models instructional delivery. The primary and intermediate reading representatives bring information to and obtain feedback from their

respective levels regarding the implementation of reading programs at this school. The ESOL coordinator assists in ensuring that ELL students are being instructed with appropriate ESOL materials. The reading coach oversees the implementation of the Accelerated Reader program. The ESE Specialist assists in monitoring the reading progress of special education students. The Reading Coach assists the team in the coordination and use of programs such as FAIR, Destination Reading, FCAT Explorer, BEEP, Accelerated Reader.

### **Major initiatives of the LLT**

Project-based learning

Writing across all content areas

### **Preschool Transition**

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

#### **Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs**

-Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary has VPK and Head Start classes on campus, allowing students to become familiar with school layout and procedures at a young age. Transitioning into our traditional elementary programs is considerably easier for these students.

-Guidance Counselor conducts beginning of the year lessons on social/emotional skills for incoming Kindergarten students.

-Pre-school students upon registration may visit before beginning school. A campus tour is provided and a interested parties are able to schedule a meeting with the leadership team members.

## 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	36%	29%	No	42%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	36%	29%	No	42%
Hispanic				
White				
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	21%	17%	No	29%
Economically disadvantaged	35%	29%	No	42%

#### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	23	15%	24%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	20	13%	18%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	49	51%	56%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	14	54%	60%

### 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	26	52%	60%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4			

### 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	57%	25%	No	61%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	58%	25%	No	62%
Hispanic				
White				
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	34%	17%	No	41%
Economically disadvantaged	57%	26%	No	61%

**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	23	15%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	14	9%	14%

**Learning Gains**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	42	43%	50%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	10	40%	48%

**Area 4: Science**

**Elementary 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]		25%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		20%

**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 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**



**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	1		4
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	52	14%	100%

**Area 8: Early Warning Systems**

**Elementary School Indicators**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	26	15%	12%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	7	4%	2%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	118	67%	40%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	9	5%	3%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	14	8%	3%

**Area 9: Parent Involvement**

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Parental involvement targets for the school**

Increased parent participation in SAC & PTA meetings

**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increased participation in SAC meetings	4	2%	10%
Increased participation in PTA meetings	6	2%	10%

**Area 10: Additional Targets**

**Additional targets for the school**

**Specific Additional Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

## Goals Summary

**G1.** Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas

### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Social Studies
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- HM Journeys
- Foundations
- Phonics for Reading
- Soar to Success
- GO Math!
- Six + Traits Writing
- Science Fusion
- Elements of Engineering
- Hands-On Science Kits

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers have limited experience teaching the Common Core State Standards and will use knowledge of these standards to address student needs.

## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increases in student proficiency on formative and summative assessments will determine next steps for professional learning and instructional support

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Monthly

**Evidence of Completion:**

Improved teacher practice that leads to increased student achievement

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

### G1. Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas

**G1.B1** Teachers have limited experience teaching the Common Core State Standards and will use knowledge of these standards to address student needs.

#### G1.B1.S1 Implement interdisciplinary Project-Based Learning in grades K-5

##### Action Step 1

Teachers and instructional coaches attended Project-Based Learning professional development sessions.

##### Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom teachers, Intensive Reading Teachers, and Instructional Coaches

##### Target Dates or Schedule

8/7/13, 8/8/13, & Ongoing

##### Evidence of Completion

Student work, Lesson plans, Formative Assessments, CWT data that reflects effective teaching practices

##### Facilitator:

Instructional Coaches & District Instructional Facilitators

##### Participants:

Classroom teachers, Intensive Reading Teachers, and Instructional Coaches

##### Action Step 6

Instructional coaches will observe teachers teaching interdisciplinary project-based lessons

##### Person or Persons Responsible

Coaches

##### Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

##### Evidence of Completion

CWTs

**Action Step 6**

Instructional coaches will plan interdisciplinary project-based lessons.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

**Evidence of Completion**

Lesson Plans

**Action Step 6**

Grade level teams will observe the instructional coach teaching a model interdisciplinary project-based learning lesson.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Coach and Grade Level Teams

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

**Evidence of Completion**

CWTs completed by grade level teams

**Action Step 6**

Grade level teams and Instructional coaches will debrief about the modeled lesson

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Coach and Grade Level Teams

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

**Evidence of Completion**

Modeled Lesson Feedback Form

### **Action Step 6**

Instructional coaches will observe teachers will teach an interdisciplinary project-based lesson

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Teachers and instructional coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

CWTs & iObservation

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1**

Plan with Intensive Reading teachers and support all teachers with their professional learning through the coaching cycle

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and Instructional Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Team meeting minutes, PLC minutes, CWT data that reflects effective teaching practices

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1**

CWT data, formative and summative assessments will be used to reflect an increase in student achievement. Data results will drive instruction.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and Instructional Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Improved teacher practices that lead to increased student achievement

**G1.B1.S2** Grade level PLCs will act as data teams to monitor student data closely. Teachers will learn how to use their data to move student achievement.

**Action Step 1**

Staff members will participate in Data Teams training.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Staff

**Target Dates or Schedule**

10/25/13

**Evidence of Completion**

PD Sign-In sheets and PD Agenda

**Facilitator:**

Instructional Coaches & District Instructional Facilitators

**Participants:**

Instructional Staff & Instructional Coaches

**Action Step 3**

Analyze data, set goals and plan instruction based on the data analysis

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Staff

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Bi-Weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

PLC minutes, Lesson Plans, Data Chats

### **Action Step 3**

Monitor and evaluate results

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Staff

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Bi-Weekly

#### **Evidence of Completion**

PLC minutes, Lesson Plans, Data Chats

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S2**

Monitor PLC's to ensure that they are data driven and that teaches work collaboratively. Model effective data chats for teachers.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and Instructional Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

PLC Agendas, Minutes, & Sign-in Sheets

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2**

Teacher observations, PLC Minutes, Team Meeting Minutes Successful implementation will produce teachers creating their lessons based on student work and data.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

PLC Minutes, Team Meeting Minutes, CWTs



### G1.B1.S3 Implement non-fiction writing across all content areas

#### Action Step 1

Instructional coaches and common core teaches will support teachers with planning non-fiction writing activities.

##### Person or Persons Responsible

Instructional Coaches, Common Core Teachers, and teachers

##### Target Dates or Schedule

8//8/13 & Ongoing

##### Evidence of Completion

CWTs, Lesson Plans, PLC meeting minutes

##### Facilitator:

Instructional Coaches

##### Participants:

Instructional Coaches, Common Core Teachers, and teachers

#### Action Step 2

Teachers will implement non-fiction writing into all subject areas. Teachers will use non-fiction writing to aid in teaching the writing process

##### Person or Persons Responsible

Instructional Coaches, Common Core Teachers, and teachers

##### Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

##### Evidence of Completion

CWTs, Lesson Plans, PLC meeting minutes

### **Action Step 3**

Coaches will observe lessons to monitor the implementation of non-fiction writing lessons.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

CWTs

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S3**

Coaches and Common Core teachers will model and support all teachers with implementation. Coaches and Common Core teachers will plan lessons and teach the writing process.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional Coaches and Administration

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

CWTs, Lesson Plans, Team Meeting Minutes

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S3**

Teacher observations, FCAT Pro, and BAT data

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and Instructional Coaches

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Data Chats CWTs Student Writing Samples

## Coordination and Integration

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

### How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A: Title I funds will go towards staff development, classroom supplies, professional development, professional development supplies, and teacher salaries. We will host Title I Family Academic Nights as well.

Title I, Part C Migrant: N/A

Title I, Part D: N/A

Title II: N/A

Title III: N/A

Title VI, Part B: N/A

Title X Homeless: N/A

SAI: Identified students will receive additional services including but not limited to before and after school camps as well tutorial materials and supplies for the students. Supplemental materials will be provided based upon identified need.

Violence Prevention Programs: MLK builds a violence prevention culture through classroom instruction in anger management, conflict resolution, bullying prevention, and the Broward County adopted character traits through our guidance program. All teachers and staff members received training on the Anti-Bullying policy. MLK also participates in the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Non-violence program, CHAMPs, and the Silence Hurts program.

Nutrition Programs: University of Florida Family Nutrition Program for First and Second Grades

Housing Programs: N/A

Adult Education: N/A

Head Start: Head Start is a national, federally funded program, providing comprehensive services to preschool children and their families. These services include educational, social, medical, vision, dental, nutritional, and mental health services.

CTE: N/A

Job Training: N/A

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy 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), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

*Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.*

### G1. Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas

**G1.B1** Teachers have limited experience teaching the Common Core State Standards and will use knowledge of these standards to address student needs.

#### G1.B1.S1 Implement interdisciplinary Project-Based Learning in grades K-5

##### PD Opportunity 1

Teachers and instructional coaches attended Project-Based Learning professional development sessions.

##### Facilitator

Instructional Coaches & District Instructional Facilitators

##### Participants

Classroom teachers, Intensive Reading Teachers, and Instructional Coaches

##### Target Dates or Schedule

8/7/13, 8/8/13, & Ongoing

##### Evidence of Completion

Student work, Lesson plans, Formative Assessments, CWT data that reflects effective teaching practices

**G1.B1.S2** Grade level PLCs will act as data teams to monitor student data closely. Teachers will learn how to use their data to move student achievement.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Staff members will participate in Data Teams training.

**Facilitator**

Instructional Coaches & District Instructional Facilitators

**Participants**

Instructional Staff & Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

10/25/13

**Evidence of Completion**

PD Sign-In sheets and PD Agenda

**G1.B1.S3** Implement non-fiction writing across all content areas

**PD Opportunity 1**

Instructional coaches and common core teaches will support teachers with planning non-fiction writing activities.

**Facilitator**

Instructional Coaches

**Participants**

Instructional Coaches, Common Core Teachers, and teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

8//8/13 & Ongoing

**Evidence of Completion**

CWTs, Lesson Plans, PLC meeting minutes

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas	\$10,880
Total		\$10,880

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Materials	Total
Title I	\$10,880	\$10,880
Total	\$10,880	\$10,880

### Budget Details

*Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.*

#### G1. Implement the CCSS/NGSSS with fidelity throughout all content areas

**G1.B1** Teachers have limited experience teaching the Common Core State Standards and will use knowledge of these standards to address student needs.

#### G1.B1.S1 Implement interdisciplinary Project-Based Learning in grades K-5

#### Action Step 1

Teachers and instructional coaches attended Project-Based Learning professional development sessions.

#### Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

#### Resource

Common Core Coach books, Common Core Resources, Intensive Reading/Math materials

#### Funding Source

Title I

#### Amount Needed

\$10,880