Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

10853 SW 216TH ST, Cutler Bay, FL 33170

http://coralreefmontessori.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Lucy Golden C

Start Date for this Principal: 9/24/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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

Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

10853 SW 216TH ST, Cutler Bay, FL 33170

http://coralreefmontessori.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	89%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 Montessori Academy Charter School's purpose is to collectively educate children with a culturally relevant pedagogy that promotes the pursuit of social justice and strengthens a child's independence, confidence, tolerance and connection to the global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a respected place of choice where a child's joy of learning is nurtured therefore embodying the highest Montessori Principles as an accredited independent charter school, to live, work play and grow in our global community.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
King, Juliet	Principal	Head of the school
Canzoneri Go, Lucy	Principal	Head of the school
McNaughton, Idsa	Assistant Principal	To Assist the Head of the School
King, Tammy	Assistant Principal	Assist the Head of the School
Boone, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher
Manresa, Maria T.	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/24/2021, Lucy Golden C

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

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

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

541

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

3

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	73	75	64	61	61	52	36	33	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	6	1	4	5	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	43	32	48	28	8	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	57	68	58	33	65	64	0	0	0	0	345
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	17	23	1	35	46	41	25	20	0	0	0	0	211

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	85	72	74	62	61	61	52	36	33	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	6	1	4	5	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	43	32	48	28	8	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	57	68	58	33	65	64	0	0	0	0	345

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	3	17	23	1	35	46	41	25	20	0	0	0	0	211

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				69%	63%	61%	66%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	61%	59%	60%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	57%	54%	60%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				48%	67%	62%	56%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				46%	63%	59%	60%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	56%	52%	50%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				52%	56%	56%	41%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	80%	78%	89%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	77%	60%	17%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					

				ELA		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2021					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	92%	60%	32%	56%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	44%	67%	-23%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	31%	69%	-38%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
06	2021					
	2019	68%	58%	10%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
07	2021					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2021					
	2019	36%	40%	-4%	46%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	58%	43%	15%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	73%	-15%	71%	-13%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool that was used to compile the data below are the i-Ready scores.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	52%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80%	79%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	3%	3%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62%	55%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	68%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	3%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61%	72%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	27%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	14%	11%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	52%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68%	75%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	3%	8%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	40%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67%	62%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	5%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	50%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%	61%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	67%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89%	86%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	10		15	45	45	20				
ELL	50			31							
BLK	30	32		17	19						
HSP	58	45	40	35	39	39	41	62	83		
WHT	66	43		52	33		50				
FRL	50	41	35	33	36	37	44	71	78		
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	43	60	77	17	35	30					
ELL	48	47		19	35	20					
BLK	45	40	53	38	46	27					
HSP	70	58	54	46	45	39	40	67	69		

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
WHT	85	76		60	56		68		73		
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	41	63	63	19	71	75					
ELL	38	60		19	50						
ASN	70			80							
BLK	50	57	70	35	57	67	7				
HSP	64	59	50	54	58	41	46	83	93		
WHT	89	62		77	62						
FRL	53	58	56	38	51	43	19	80	75		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

The trends observed are weaknesses in ELA where only 51% of 4th grade and 41% of the 6th grade were proficient in the spring 2021 ELA FSA.

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

Data from progress monitoring tool such as i-Ready and 2019 State Assessments indicate a significant gap and weakness in vocabulary and informational text.

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 related to the need for improvement are the inconsistent attendance during online instruction coupled with a low number of students attending "Brick and Mortar" and the high rates of closure and quarantine due to COVID-19 pandemic.

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

Progress monitoring data coupled with achievement scores (SAT-10) for Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd graders showed student performance above national percentiles both in 2019 and 2021.

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

The school stayed committed to using the Montessori method utilizing the Montessori materials in teaching kindergarten even during the instructional continuity plan. Whereas the older grades relied less on Montessori materials.

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

ELL students will need to be intensified since our ELL scored the lowest on our ELA. CRMA will do this with ongoing professional development with a reading coach that specializes in ELL.

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.

Professional developments planned includes a ELA coach who has experience working with ELL learners. She will train teachers effective methods for including literature among all students, particularly ELL by providing teachers with the tools for improving vocabulary and other literary skills.

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

A reading interventionist has been hired and will be targeting all tier 3 students in ELA in grades 1st-8th, in addition to the classroom teacher and assistant monitoring progress through data analysis from weekly assessments both in the classroom and by the interventionist.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Co-Directors conducted a 3 year qualitative case study and compared the school disciple data to 3 schools across the country. The school had less disciple disparities by race and ethnicities than the state but they still had discipline disparities between black, hispanics and whites; indicating that there is racial and ethnic bias when writing up discipline referrals. The school has created a School Wide Eliminating Discipline Disparities Team at all grade levels. Professional development has been ongoing since 2019, and continues to support this initiative. CRMA is creating tools to support staff at all levels and throughout all aspects of the school culture to more effectively address student social and emotional well being and eradicate disciple disparities based on race. The team meets monthly, and is also developing discipline policies that aline themselves with the Montessori philosophy.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The Montessori Philosophy inherently infuses social and emotional learning where by inclusivity and community building are an integral part or the school climate. The staff works closely with PTA to to ensure the voices of all parents are utilized in various ways such as school events, cultural celebrations and fine arts performances. The school has a very diverse administration, staff and school body. Inclusivity and cultural contributions are celebrated globally and equitably.

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

The PLST leadership team identifies the needs of the staff in order to promote priorities staff in order to support them in instruction. The Montessori for social justice group is a committee that is focusing on discipline disparities, and is working with all staff to provide training to help teachers cope with the challenges that are faced, especially during this COVID period. The ultimate goal is to eliminate discipline disparities, the ESSAC team is a diverse array of representation of both staff, parents, business and community leaders, as well as our board of directors who collectively come up with ways in which student improvement becomes the focus. By looking at data and making decisions that will help promote learning the technology leadership team supports teachers in their training and understanding of best practices by infusing the best practices in technology and mitigating any possible barriers for teachers and staff to incorporate technology in the classroom. The mental health team, are a group of teachers, school leaders, and mental health partners that are looking at the overall social and emotional well being of the school through data community partnerships, ongoing counseling and services, including professional development. The threat assessment team is also combined of a group of diverse staff members, school leaders, security personnel who are putting forth the safety of the students, as the focal point for the school year, including a police officer. Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter school PTA also works closely with staff. In addition, the Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School Board of Directors, ensures that policies are in alignment with school district and state guidelines.

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	**$0.00**