Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

10853 SW 216TH ST, Cutler Bay, FL 33170

http://coralreefmontessori.dadeschools.net

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Canzoneri Go, Lucy	Principal	Head of School
King, Juliet	Principal	Head of School
McNaughton, Idsa	Assistant Principal	Assist the Head of School
King, Tammy	Assistant Principal	Assist the Head of School
Encinas, Monica	Other	Lead and Support the Teachers
Boone, Joanna	Teacher, PreK	Lead Teacher
Arizaga, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher
Encalada, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Lead Middle School Teacher
Manresa, Maria T.	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The stakeholders are the school administrative team, a teacher from each grade group and a parent representative. They are given an opportunity to see the data and to discuss it. we discuss how we need to move forward as a school. Their input is valuable.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Principals will be involved in the data chats with a focus on our ELL and SWD students to ensure that they make the progress.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	8	9	9	10	7	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	16	17	6	7	3	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	8	4	0	7	12	6	7	1	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	7	10	10	11	7	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	25	10	7	8	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	7	1	14	18	20	12	8	88

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	8	4	0	7	12	6	7	1	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	7	10	10	11	7	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	25	10	7	8	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	7	1	14	18	20	12	8	88

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	59	61	53	64	62	55	52		
ELA Learning Gains				58			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			39		
Math Achievement*	43	63	55	39	51	42	33		
Math Learning Gains				58			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			31		
Science Achievement*	40	56	52	40	60	54	42		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	77	68	63	68	59	61		
Middle School Acceleration	63	75	70	53	61	51	78		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	71	62	55	56	75	70	46		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	2	2
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	59			43			40	64	63			71
SWD	30			17			29				4	
ELL	47			41			45				4	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			28			17				4	
HSP	65			46			50	64	70		7	71
MUL												

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	56			52			40				3	
FRL	49			35			30				5	75

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	58	46	39	58	49	40	63	53			56
SWD	33	41	33	5	39	40	8					
ELL	47	50		15	31							56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	51	35	26	57	56	33					
HSP	70	59	52	41	56	44	41	67	61			56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	68		50	66		54					
FRL	59	56	40	36	57	55	45	57	57			50

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	43	39	33	35	31	42	61	78			46
SWD	23	10		15	45	45	20					
ELL	50			31								46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	32		17	19							
HSP	58	45	40	35	39	39	41	62	83			50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	43		52	33		50					
FRL	50	41	35	33	36	37	44	71	78			30

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	51%	-4%	47%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	50%	17%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	48%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	63%	-22%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	64%	-20%	61%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	43%	40%	3%	44%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	51%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	68%	-8%	66%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

A close look at the data reveals weaknesses in SWD sub group. Based on the data from 2022, SWD are now a targeted subgroup since only 33% were proficient in ELA for that year. When looking at the lowest of 25% of SWD, only 33% made gains in 2022 in comparison to 77% in 2019. The contributing factors related to the improvement are high student and staff absences due to COVID and other at risk illnesses.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

According to the Federal Index for 2022 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.The contributing factors related to the improvement are high student and staff absences due to COVID and other at risk illnesses.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The SWD students had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There were many students who were taken through the MTSS process, due to the gaps they had from the high student and staff absences due to COVID and other at risk illnesses.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

A close look at the data reveals that our ELA scores improved greatly across the school grades. An interventionist was hired that worked with the students in 3rd grade. Teachers participated in data chats to determine which students needed intervention. There were many students who were taken through the MTSS process.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on the EWS data from Part 1, we identified two potential areas of concern. We are targeting our Kindergarten students for tutoring and 2nd and 3rd grade students who scored a one's and two's on the state wide assessments.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year is summer school which targeted the lowest 35% for 2023 AP2 data for the rising 2,3,4,5,6 grades. We have an aftercare STEM science program in grade 1st-8th grade. We are targeting the kindergarten for tutoring. We looked at AP3 data to determine the next group we are targeting, 2nd and 3rd grade students. Our ESOL coordinator did a presentation for the teachers giving strategies and discussing interventions.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our school culture has not been positive for a few years, during our accreditation the team was working on this with the staff. However, COVID pandemic came and it isolated staff even more, we had several staff leave. This year we began the year fully staffed and that hasn't happened in the past couple of years. We would like to keep this current staff. There are those who have been with us for 25 years and that needed to be celebrated, as well as welcome the new staff.

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

We currently have 26 teachers, 26 assistants, 3 specials teachers and we would like to have them at the end of the year. We want to maintain 100% of our instructional staff.

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

We have hired a Lead Teacher Administrator to support the teachers in addition to the other administrative staff .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Team building and encouraging trainings will be given through out the year to help the staff build support systems to avoid burn out and emotional fatigue.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this evidence-based intervention is by providing these things to the teachers they will feel heard and supported and it will help to maintain their desire to stay in the teaching profession.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

We celebrated our 25th Anniversary and we took all of the staff to the Tea Room. We have been doing monthly teacher appreciation gifts and we will continue this year. We will be having team building trainings, so that our staff get to know each other and feels supported. We have also dedicated a day in the month for the staff who are willing and able, to meet for happy hour.

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

By When: The 2023/ 2024 school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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.

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

The schools ELL Federal Index will increase from 40% in 2022 to 45% for 2024. Or targeted focus is to increase our ELL achievement from 47% to 50% in 2023 as indicated in the FAST ELA score.

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 ELL student weaknesses through instruction and remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 tier2 and tier 3 data.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 2023/2024 school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the last two years sub group data, SWD, are now targeted sub group 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 sub group.

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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 students IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Dr. King and Dr. Golden will be monitoring professional development to make sure that they align with the Federal Index. They will also be a part of the monthly data chats with the principals to determine the progress of the students to determine the allocations and ensure resources based on needs by monitoring funding for tutoring and for interventions.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				$2,650.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0070 - Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School	School Improvement Funds		$2,650.00
			Notes: Salary for the Tutor for the Kindergarten students			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
					Total:	$2,650.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No