Coral Reef Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Coral Reef Elementary School

6151 HAGEN RANCH RD, Lake Worth, FL 33467

https://cres.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Coral Reef Elementary, along with the School District of Palm Beach County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster knowledge, skills and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Coral Reef Elementary, along with the School District of Palm Beach County envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Moretto, Bobbi	Principal
DiPietro, Toni	Assistant Principal
Pascarella, Marissa	Psychologist
O'Halloran, Jenny	School Counselor
Damiani, Susan	Teacher, K-12
Palkovitz, Tami	Teacher, K-12
Christensen, Robin	Teacher, K-12
Scott, Dana	Teacher, K-12
Rogers, Andrea	Teacher, K-12
Bogler, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
James, Ashley	Teacher, K-12
Balassone, Amy	Other
Matteodo, Jennifer	Instructional Media

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Each Leadership team member is responsible for providing input at meetings to ensure that the most appropriate strategies are put into placed to support students, teachers and parents. Members include the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, school psychologist, SAC Chair, and team leaders from each grade level Kindergarten thorough grade five. They attend all meetings so that there is consistency when reviewing ongoing progress of students. Data is tracked and monitored through weekly School Based Team meetings and Monthly Data Team meetings. Members review

data and present current best practices throughout the year in small groups, large groups with individual teachers, SAC and parents as needed.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	21	15	16	17	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	5	3	4	22	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	1	0	1	14	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

Date this data was collected

Thursday 8/2/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	11	11	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	45	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	4	3	20	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	11	11	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	38	33	35	28	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	5	3	4	22	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The Lowest 25% in both ELA and Math have consistently been the lowest performing achievement area. ELA achievement in this component dropped 5% from 52% in 2017 to 47% in 2018. Also, Math achievement in this component also dropped 4% from 51% in 2017 to 47% in 2018. It does seem to be a trend in this data component.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math achievement by the Lowest 25% declined the most- 11%, from 58% in 2017 to 47% in 2018.
The WHT student subgroup in this component declined 29%, from 79% in 2017 to 50% in 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The ELA Lowest 25% achievement gap between the school at 47% and the state, at 48%, is -1%.
ELA raw data:
*3rd grade is at 72% a drop of 2% from 2017 to 2018
*4th grade is at 73% an increase of 5% from 2017 to 2018
*5th grade is at 68% a drop 4% from 2017 to 2018

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

*ELLs improved 10% from 2017 to 2018 in ELA Achievement from 28% proficient to 38% proficient. No this does not seem to be a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

During the FY18 school year, classroom teachers worked closely with our ELL facilitator. Classroom teachers provided differentiated Reading lessons for those ELL students . Students were immersed in Effective Instruction and involved in active learning within the homeroom classroom.

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

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	57%	56%	68%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	61%	55%	65%	56%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	56%	48%	55%	51%	46%
Math Achievement	80%	65%	62%	76%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%	63%	59%	71%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	47%	58%	51%	46%
Science Achievement	76%	56%	55%	65%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	21 (13)	15 (14)	16 (11)	17 (11)	8 (18)	16 (15)	93 (82)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (2)	2 (2)	5 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (41)	25 (45)	30 (56)	78 (142)

Grade Level Data
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	2018	72%	56%	16%	57%	15%	
	2017	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	73%	58%	15%	56%	17%	
	2017	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2018	68%	59%	9%	55%	13%	

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	72%	52%	20%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	80%	63%	17%	62%	18%
	2017	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	78%	63%	15%	62%	16%
	2017	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2018	78%	66%	12%	61%	17%
	2017	72%	61%	11%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	75%	56%	19%	55%	20%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	33	49	42	43	46	34	41				
ELL	38	68	61	47	44	33	18				
ASN	79	76		96	65						
BLK	56	43	42	62	46	27	67				
HSP	70	59	50	77	63	52	67				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	74	64	47	84	71	50	80				
FRL	64	59	48	71	60	47	66				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	39	27	40	50	37	38				
ELL	28	45	39	41	55	41					
ASN	96	79		100	71						
BLK	48	52	29	55	55	40	44				
HSP	68	68	46	66	58	44	76				
MUL	60	55		67	55						
WHT	77	67	49	86	73	79	78				
FRL	56	59	45	61	55	43	59				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	To ensure progress towards student achievement within the Lowest 25% in both ELA and Math instruction to support proficiency by 3rd grade.
Rationale	The Lowest 25% in both ELA and Math have had the greatest decline in achievement from 2017-2018. This area of focus aligns with the /district Strategic Plan to increase reading proficiency by 3rd grade.
Intended Outcome	Improve The Lowest 25% ELA proficiency by 18% , from 47% in 2018 to 65% in 2019. Increase Reading proficiency in third grade by 6% to be on target for meeting the LTO of the Strategic Plan by 2021.
Point Person	Bobbi Moretto (bobbi.moretto@palmbeachschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	Using the Pillars of Effective Instruction students will be immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statue 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity with focus on Math and Reading. *Through a balanced literacy approach, students will increase reading proficiency by participating in a daily 90 minute literacy block and engaging in high quality text across other content areas. * Teachers will use data collected from I-Ready to group students, differentiate instruction and engage them in rigorous tasks. *Teachers will use small group instruction to facilitate student growth. *Teachers will align text, talk and task to ensure students meet the full intent and rigor of the standards.
Person Responsible	Bobbi Moretto (bobbi.moretto@palmbeachschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	The principal and assistant principal will monitor instruction and student performance. Teachers will monitor and utilize data from I-Ready and discuss best practices to meet the full intent and rigor of standards during weekly PLC's.
Person Responsible	Bobbi Moretto (bobbi.moretto@palmbeachschools.org)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$6,500.00**