

Broward County Public Schools

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/16/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (38%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (45%)
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	CSI

* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D	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.

The vision of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Montessori Academy is to engage the entire school community in the pursuit of achieving reading proficiency in a nurturing learner-focused environment

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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.
Richards, Alicia	Math 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.
Facyson, Latoya	Reading Coach	As the literacy coach, Facyson'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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/16/2022, Mitshuca Moreau

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

484

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	73	69	83	69	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	52	34	26	32	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	4	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	29	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	24	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	0	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	0	2	25	33	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	25	21	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	58%	56%				33%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						58%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						64%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	50%				49%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						54%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						48%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	13%	59%	59%				16%	46%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	30%	60%	-30%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	62%	-19%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	26%	59%	-33%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	67%	-14%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	64%	-27%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	13%	49%	-36%	53%	-40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	67		21	6		7				
ELL	25			75							
BLK	26	42	41	49	56	44	13				
FRL	26	42	40	51	56	42	14				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our ELA data component score is 26% 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Lowest quartile Math scoring at 48% and overall Math Learning gains at 55%

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 Math 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 frontload 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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The goal is to have 41% of students from the African American and SWD subgroups to attain proficiency on the statewide assessment. Data trends show that there is still a need to close learning gaps in ELA for all students.

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

By June 2023, 41% of students in grades 3-5 in the African American and SWD subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST Assessment in ELA.

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

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:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research show that PLCs are effective in improving instructional practices and teacher pedagogy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Content area coaches will facilitate content-aligned planning.
2. Provide support based on classroom walkthrough data.
3. Ensure that the PLC's are aligned to a problem of practice.
4. 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.
5. Teachers will implement scaffolding strategies to assist with meeting the needs of all students.
6. Work with ESE Specialist and ESE teacher to provide trainings for teachers on IEP's and specific accommodations to better meet the needs of ESE students.

Person Responsible

Briana Ashley (briana.mccutcheon@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The goal is to improve teacher capacity in Tier 1 instruction for all content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

June 2023, the goal is to increase math proficiency beyond 50%; increase science and ELA proficiency to 42% of the students scoring a level 3 or higher as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

School leaders will provide support and monitor Tier 1 instruction. 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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research show that PLCs are effective in improving instructional practices and teacher pedagogy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Content area coaches will facilitate content-aligned planning.
2. Provide support based on classroom walkthrough data.
3. Ensure that the PLC's are aligned to a problem of practice.
4. 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.
5. Teachers will implement scaffolding strategies to assist with meeting the needs of all students

Person Responsible

Mitshuca Moreau (mitshuca.moreau@browardschools.com)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

As evidenced by the Spring 2022 iReady AP 3 Diagnostic. The ELA combined proficiency for K-2 is 42%. The data indicates a need to evaluate and provide high quality Tier 1 instruction and targeted support to close achievement gaps for students who are one or more grade levels below to reach 45% proficiency in the FAST assessments.

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

As evidenced by the Florida Standards Assessment results, ELA proficiency is 26% combined for 3-5th grade. The data indicates a need to evaluate and provide high quality Tier 1 instruction and targeted support to close achievement gaps for students who are one or more grade levels below to reach 45% proficiency in the FAST assessments.

Measurable Outcomes:

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

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

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, 45% of students in grades K-2nd will be proficient according to the FAST progress monitoring Assessments PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, 45% of students in grades 3-5th will be proficient according to the FAST progress monitoring Assessments PM3.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Teacher professional development being implemented
Focused Classroom walkthroughs with targeted feedback
Progress monitoring of informal and formal assessments to include data dive meetings and analysis

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Moreau, Mitshuca, mitshuca.moreau@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

Evidence-based practices and programs are aligned to BEST Standards and State road map for Tier 1 schools.

All District adopted curriculum resources will be aligned to standards

Instructional practices will include Standard-based planning and Front Loading sessions; effective delivery of Tier 1 instruction and Tier Coaching support for teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

The rationale for the selected areas of focus is based on the iReady Diagnostic AP3 proficiency levels of 42% combined for grades K-2 and the 26% combined proficiency levels for grades 3-5 on the Spring 22 FSA.

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Implement common planning sessions after school that will be supported by the UniSIG Grant for all ELA content area classroom and Academic Support teachers.	Moreau, Mitshuca, mitshuca.moreau@browardschools.com
Progress monitoring of the implementation of Tier 1 Standards-based instructional lessons, delivery, and student activities.	Moreau, Mitshuca, mitshuca.moreau@browardschools.com

Provide professional development on Tier 1 instruction, BEST Standards, and new District/State adoption of instructional curriculum materials.

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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 parities and milestones in learning.