

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 9/22/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

10853 SW 216TH ST, Cutler Bay, FL 33170

<http://coralreefmontessori.dadeschools.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>33%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>93%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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

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
King, Juliet	Principal	Head of the School
Canzoneri Go, Lucy	Principal	Head of School
McNaughton, Idsa	Assistant Principal	To assist the head of school
King, Tammy	Assistant Principal	To assist the head of school
Arizaga, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher
Encalada, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher
Encinas, Monica	Teacher, PreK	Lead Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/22/2022, Lucy Golden C

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

533

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

4

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

3

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	69	87	66	69	54	63	58	37	30	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	3	8	4	0	7	12	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	7	10	10	11	7	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	25	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	6	7	1	14	18	20	12	8	0	0	0	0	88

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/22/2022

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	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	

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	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	9	7	10	10	11	7	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	25	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	87
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	

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	64%	62%	55%				69%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						59%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						54%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	39%	51%	42%				48%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	58%						46%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						34%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	40%	60%	54%				52%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	68%	59%				60%	80%	78%

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	77%	60%	17%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2022					
	2019	92%	60%	32%	56%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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	44%	67%	-23%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	31%	69%	-38%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
06	2022					
	2019	68%	58%	10%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
07	2022					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	40%	-4%	46%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	43%	15%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	73%	-15%	71%	-13%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%

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	33	41	33	5	39	40	8				
ELL	47	50		15	31						
BLK	44	51	35	26	57	56	33				
HSP	70	59	52	41	56	44	41	67	61		
WHT	69	68		50	66		54				
FRL	59	56	40	36	57	55	45	57	57		
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		
WHT	85	76		60	56		68		73		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 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	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 trends that emerged across our school is that overall we improved 12% (64% proficient) in ELA in 2022 in comparison to 2021 where only 52% were proficient. However, a closer look reveals weaknesses in SWD and ELL subgroups. Based on the last two years subgroup data, SWD, are now a targeted subgroup since only 33% are proficient in ELA for 2022, an increase of 10% points from 2021 but down 10% points from 2019. When looking at the lowest 25% of SWD, only 33% made gains in 2022 in comparison to 77% in 2019. However, in comparison to 2021 SWD overall gains in ELA went from 10% to 41% in 2022. According to the Federal Index for 2022 SWD made 28% therefore they are a targeted subgroup. For ELL, 47% were proficient in ELA and 50% made gains. However, according to the Federal Index ELL were at 42% in 2021 and they went down to 40% in 2022 making them a targeted

sub group. Looking at the ELA 2022 scores show that 31% of our 7th graders scored a level 1 and 21% of our 8th graders scored level 1.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

A closer look at ELA 2022 scores shows that 31% of our 7th graders scored level 1.

21% of our 8th grade scored level 1.

16% of our 6th graders scored level 1.

16% of our 5th graders scored level 1.

Data from our program monitoring tool iReady and the 2022 ELA scores shows a weakness in Language and editing, which would include vocabulary and grammar.

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 high student and staff absences due to COVID and other at risk illnesses. The action to be taken was that new staff were hired, particularly in the Middle School where we added another teacher.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Data components showed improvement and highest gains were in our kindergarten SAT scores which were above the national percentiles in 2022, and according to our 3rd grade students, there were 9 students who did not pass the FSA in comparison to 2021 where there were 28 students who did not pass the ELA FSA.

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

Contributing factors to improvement were that 100% of students went back to school in person an additional 45% increase from 2020-2021, where only 55% of our students attended school in person.

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

Strategies to be implemented to accelerate learning are to address new B.E.S.T. standards. Workshops in ELA and Math will be given in addition to how to identify students who need additional support through the MTSS. More consistent use of the Montessori materials, and more incentives for improving attendance will also be targeted.

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.

There will be two Master teachers who will provide ongoing training for 2022-2023 in both ELA and Math to include B.E.S.T. standards. There were also new math books purchased to address the new B.E.S.T. standards in grades 3-8th.

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability this year will be, the PTA along with the school will sponsor parent workshops on Montessori curriculum, identifying trauma in students and the importance of school safety. An additional teacher was hired in Middle school to lower student to teacher ratio. More mental Health services are being provided with an additional part-time counselor.

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 English Language Learners

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>For ELL, 47% were proficient in ELA and 50% made gains. However, according to the Federal Index ELL were at 42% in 2021 and they went down to 40% in 2022 making them a targeted sub group.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>The schools ELL Federal Index will increase from 40% in 2022 to 45% for 2023. Our targeted focus is to increase our ELL achievement from 47% to 50% in 2023 as indicated in the FAST ELA score.</p>
<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>The school will use the data from the baseline and mid-year assessment in both the FAST and iReady to target ELL student weaknesses through instruction and remediation.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Lucy Canzoneri Go (lcanzoneri-golden@dadeschools.net)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</p>	<p>Teachers will use differentiated instruction both small group and individual with resources such as iReady tool box and MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and monitoring.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.</p>	<p>By collecting data, both every twenty days for tier 2 and weekly for tier 3 instructors and teachers assistant support staff can effectively target specific skills as needed.</p>

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.

There will be monthly data chats with the principal. In addition, both assistant principals will be monitoring the tier 2 and tier 3 with the teachers.

Person Responsible Lucy Canzoneri Go (lcanzoneri-golden@dadeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Based on the last two years subgroup data, SWD, are now a targeted subgroup since only 33% are proficient in ELA for 2022, an increase of 10% points from 2021 but down 10% points from 2019. When looking at the lowest 25% of SWD, only 33% made gains in 2022 in comparison to 77%in 2019. However, in comparison to 2021 SWD overall gains in ELA went from10% to 41%in 2022. According to the Federal Index for 2022 SWD made 28%therefore they are a targeted subgroup.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school's SWD Federal Index will increase from 28% in 2022 to 42% in 2023. Our targeted focus is to increase our lowest 25% from 33% who made adequate gains in 2022 to 50% making gains in 2023 evidenced in the 2023 FAST ELA scores.

Monitoring:

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

The school will use the data from the baseline and mid-year assessment in both the FAST and iReady to target SWD student weaknesses through instruction and remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Idsa McNaughton (mcnaughton@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers and ESE staff will use the collaborate and consultative model to ensure that the ESE teachers are reinforcing the skills that the classroom teacher has identified in need of remediation through differentiated instruction in a small group or individually when needed as stipulated by the student's IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

By consistently collecting data, collaborating and consulting with the classroom teacher, the ESE teacher will be able to more successfully target areas of weaknesses.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

For 2nd grade, 60% scored less than 50% on the SAT, which means they are not on track to score level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. This population of students will work with an interventionist in Reading/ELA as well as small group and individual lessons with their classroom teacher.

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

Due to the fact that 60% 2022's of 2nd graders (current 3rd graders) scored less than the 50th percentile, they will be targeted for additional lessons in Reading/ELA.

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)

The schools 2nd graders (this years 3rd graders) will go from 40% scoring 3 or above to 52% scoring 3 or above.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The schools 3rd graders (last years 2nd graders) will go from 40% scoring 3 or above to 52% scoring 3 or above.

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.

The school will use the data from the baseline and mid-year assessment in both the FAST and iReady to target 3rd grade students (last years 2nd grade) weaknesses through instruction and remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McNaughton, Idsa, mcnaughton@dadeschools.net

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?

Teachers will use differentiated instruction both small group and individual with resources such as iReady tool box which aligns itself with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards and is an evidence-based program. MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and monitoring will also be implemented. In addition, an interventionist is working with students that did not score above the 50th percentile, in the area of their weaknesses, to prepare them for the 3rd grade testing.

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?

By collecting data, both every twenty days for tier 2 and weekly for tier 3 instructors and teachers assistant support staff can effectively target specific skills as needed.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

There will be monthly data chats with the principal to determine the progress of the students. In addition, both assistant principals will be monitoring the tier 2 and tier 3 with the teachers, to maintain the fidelity of the intervention. Students will be assessed monthly for tier 2, and weekly for tier 3 and a master teacher will be providing professional learning in ELA aligned with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

King, Juliet,
juking@dadeschools.net

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.

The Montessori Philosophy inherently infuses social and emotional learning where by inclusivity and community building are an integral part of the school climate. The staff works closely with PTA 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. The school has worked diligently to eliminate discipline disparities where blacks have historically had disproportionately write ups for discipline infractions in comparison to whites and hispanics.

According to the student case management system (SCMS) for 2021-2022. Referral reasons and SPAR incidents, discipline disparities for black students were lowered significantly in comparison to the past five years. There are approximately 23% of our students identify as black, 8% white, 65% Hispanic, and 3% multi-racial. According to the data from the 2021-22 Threat Assessments, blacks made up 36% of the threats in comparison to whites who only made up 14%.

However, discipline referrals were lowered significantly. Only 25% of blacks had referrals for disruptive behavior, 17% of blacks were written up for confrontation with another student, only 13% of blacks were written up for failing to comply with classroom rules, 40% of blacks were written up for confrontation with a staff member, 25% of blacks were written up for failing to comply with previous corrective strategies, 0%of

blacks were written up for for fighting, 20% of blacks were written up for provocative language directed at someone, 0% of blacks were written up for instigative behavior, 20% of blacks were written up for defiance of school personnel, 0% of blacks were written up for bullying, 0% of blacks were written up for sexual harassment.

We also made academic gains in ELA with our federal index for blacks from 25% in 2021 to 43% in 2022. The school continues to provide on going training to staff to recognize racial biases and focus on creating a positive, healthy, social emotional, self esteem for all the students. The school has provided ongoing research based training such as Crossroads and Olweus Anti-Bulling program to all staff.

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

CRMA has several teams that work with parents, staff and administrations to promote a positive school culture and environment: PLST team, Montessori for Social Justice, ESSAC team, Mental Health team, Threat Assessment team and Hospitality team.

PLST leadership team identifies the needs of the staff in order to promote priorities, and support their instruction.

The Montessori for Social Justice team 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.

The ESSAC team is a diverse 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.

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 partnership, ongoing counseling and services, including professional development.

The Threat Assessment team is also a combination 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.

The Hospitality Team provides encouragement to the staff to promote good morale among the faculty and staff, by providing treats and recognizing birthdays.

In addition, to these teams that promote a positive school culture, the CRMA Board of Directors continues to represent a diverse body of members who ensure that the school complies with all District, State and Federal regulations.