
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://www.keyscharter.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Corinne Armstrong

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: C (51%)
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	TS&I
* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://www.keyscharter.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	92%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	C

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.

Motivate Inspire Achieve: Keys Gate Charter School will provide students with the necessary tools and skills needed to develop superior levels of achievement. We will strive for academic, social and physical excellence by providing a quality and challenging curriculum. We will promote positive moral and social values, foster an atmosphere of self-discipline in a safe learning environment, and maximize individual productivity to meet the needs of a changing global society. Students of the Keys Gate Charter School will be able to maximize their potential for successfully actualizing their goals with confidence and intrinsic motivation, thereby enabling each student to become a lifelong learner and strong functional contributor to their local community as well as their global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be the premier school in our area, committed to providing a safe and nurturing environment with high levels of student academic achievement. We will foster strong values within our students based on character education curriculum that creates a positive impact on our community, nation, and world

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baez, Corinne	Principal	
Thermes, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Veras, Yudibeth	Assistant Principal	
Beltran, Sandra		

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	180	205	205	230	240	240	225	225	245	0	0	0	0	1995
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	10	11	22	46	32	21	36	52	0	0	0	0	241
Level 1 on statewide assessment	16	38	55	16	98	129	95	111	160	0	0	0	0	718

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	12	11	27	20	62	86	47	69	99	0	0	0	0	433

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/5/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	63%	61%	50%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	61%	59%	52%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	57%	54%	46%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	65%	67%	62%	59%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	59%	62%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	56%	52%	53%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	56%	56%	39%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	80%	78%	53%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	180 (0)	205 (0)	205 (0)	230 (0)	240 (0)	240 (0)	225 (0)	225 (0)	245 (0)	1995 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 ()	3 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	11 ()	10 (0)	11 (0)	22 (0)	46 (0)	32 (0)	21 (0)	36 (0)	52 (0)	241 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	16 ()	38 (0)	55 (0)	16 (0)	98 (0)	129 (0)	95 (0)	111 (0)	160 (0)	718 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	64%	-11%	58%	-5%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	62%	58%	4%	54%	8%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	45%	56%	-11%	52%	-7%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2019	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
	2018	66%	67%	-1%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	69%	-11%	64%	-6%
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	71%	65%	6%	60%	11%
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
06	2019	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
08	2019	57%	40%	17%	46%	11%
	2018	47%	38%	9%	45%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%
	2018	39%	44%	-5%	50%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	68%	29%	67%	30%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		97%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
2018	64%	72%	-8%	71%	-7%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
2018	96%	59%	37%	62%	34%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	57%	43%
2018	96%	54%	42%	56%	40%
Compare		4%			

Subgroup Data

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	16	38	42	24	42	40	19	50			
ELL	44	50	42	52	61	50	34	44	50		
BLK	48	49	39	58	56	43	34	65	35		
HSP	54	53	48	65	65	53	45	65	67		
MUL	54	30		77	60						
WHT	65	61	60	76	77	71	63	65	71		
FRL	51	52	47	62	63	52	42	64	60		
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	12	39	38	21	40	36	11	15			
ELL	35	55	61	46	61	51	27	40			
ASN	73	70		73	60						
BLK	41	48	44	49	51	35	25	70			
HSP	58	62	61	65	65	51	53	63	76		
MUL	57	58		86	92						
WHT	73	64	69	74	68	64	76	74	78		
FRL	54	59	58	64	64	48	53	59	71		
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	34	35	17	40	39	4	20			
ELL	27	46	45	38	56	52	10	29			
ASN	75	75		82	73						
BLK	38	50	47	45	51	40	29	36	67		
HSP	49	52	44	59	63	57	38	52	57		
MUL	57	44		64	50						
WHT	72	59	54	80	72	63	63	82	69		
FRL	46	50	46	56	61	55	32	48	54		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	49
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	68
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is the lowest 25% of student in ELA. The ELA lowest 25% of students showed only 47% growth from 2018-2019. ELA instruction showed the lowest performance due to a large amount of new teachers with a lack of instructional experience and a large increase in enrollment.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from 2018-2019 is Science. Science proficiency declined by 7% with an overall proficiency of 45% in 2019. This was an impact to school accountability in both 5th and 8th grade. The level of science proficiency decreased from the prior year based on a few contributing factors: Protection of Instructional Time in grade 5 and lack of content knowledge / opportunities to apply content through hands-on lessons in 8th grade.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Social Studies achievement. When compared to the state (78%), Social Studies proficiency (64%) demonstrated a 14% difference. Although KGCS maintained 64% proficiency from 2018 to 2019, there is a gap that is

being caused by a lack of targeted focus on standards based instruction and teacher content knowledge. An additional correlation may be caused by low reading skills required to perform on Civics statewide assessments.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the lowest 25% of students in math. When compared to 2018 (48%), 53% of students showed a learning gain in math. This is a positive difference of 5%. This group of students had more prior knowledge base when entering 5th grade. Small group, targeted instruction based on quarterly assessment data was implemented in order to demonstrate growth in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

In reflecting on the EWS data, two concerns are the amount of students who scored a level one in either Reading and Math and the amount of students who have two or more EWS indicators.

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

1. Civics Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Civics Proficiency
Rationale	Students will use standards-based online programs with fidelity (PrepWorks).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By implementing both standards based lessons and online programs civics proficiency will increase from 64% to at least 70% proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Review weekly program reports and host student data chats. Classroom walkthroughs with specific feedback for teacher support and common planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through use of the program reports, teachers/admin/support staff will be able to monitor both teacher implementation and student progress as evidenced by mastery of units. The classroom walk through TFET form will be used to provide feedback and coaching sessions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers in the implementation of PrepWorks and monitoring reports. 2. Train students in the weekly requirement and progress monitoring tools. 3. Provide common planning support with the Curriculum Resource Teacher to create engaging and effective lesson plans. 4. Following classroom walk throughs, provide teacher with feedback and coaching as needed.
Person Responsible	Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	The students will participate in hands-on science lab experiments and teachers will work with our Curriculum Resource Teachers to plan effective, standards-based lessons in alignment with the pacing guide.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By students attending the science lab (grade 5) each week, students will participate in at least one or more science experiments. Grade 8 students will conduct labs, use Study Island with fidelity and STEM activities that are focused on the pacing guide resources.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	CRTs will have weekly planning team meetings with teachers as well as science lab teacher to create effective lessons. Through use of the Study Island program reports, teachers/admin/support staff will be able to monitor both teacher implementation and student progress as evidenced by mastery of lessons with at least 80% accuracy. The classroom walk through TFET form will be used to provide feedback and coaching sessions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through use of the program reports, teachers/admin/support staff will be able to monitor both teacher implementation and student progress as evidenced by mastery of units. The classroom walk through TFET form will be used to provide feedback and coaching sessions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers in the implementation of Study Island and monitoring reports. 2. Train students in the weekly requirement and progress monitoring tools. 3. Provide common planning support with the Curriculum Resource Teacher to create engaging and effective lesson plans and science lab experiments. 4. Following classroom walk throughs, provide teacher with feedback and coaching as needed.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
Rationale	The students will be targeted for small-group instruction in order to increase learning gains. Interventions, including pull out, push in, after school and Saturday tutoring sessions. will also be provided in order to support below level learners academic growth
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Throughout the year, students will participate in small group instruction and quarterly assessments/NWEA. By monitoring student growth through analyzing data reports available, students will make a minimum of one year's growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Yudibeth Veras (933033@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady Reading Plus Data-driven small group Classroom walk throughs with feedback Cross curricular planning with curriculum resource teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By use of iReady / Reading Plus data reports, students will show learning gains. Data-driven small group will provide targeted instruction at the students level to increase learning. Classroom walk throughs with feedback along with cross curricular planning with curriculum resource teachers will ensure effective lessons are planning and implemented.
Action Step	
Description	1. Train teachers and students in iReady / Reading Plus implementation, monitoring and growth reports 2. Host student data chats through assessments 3. Create instructional focus programs targeted student needs 4. Differentiate instruction through the use of the iReady Teacher Toolbox and data reports.
Person Responsible	Yudibeth Veras (933033@dadeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Attendance Rate
Rationale	KGCS will implement and monitor daily attendance tracking through Control D reporting and Hero positive behavior system to increase the attendance rate and thus increasing school grade.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The attendance rate will increase and the amount of students that have unexcused absences will decrease.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Beltran (933922@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	KGCS will utilize Hero for positive behavior points for attendance tracking. The schools mental health team, threat assessment team and school based leadership team will monitor the attendance through control D reports and implement incentives and parent communication as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By a continued focus on monitoring, communicating and providing incentives to students/families, the attendance rate will increase.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor bi-weekly attendance 2. Train and implement Hero with stakeholders 3. Monitor Hero monthly reports and reward students 4. Reward students for perfect attendance.
Person Responsible	Sandra Beltran (933922@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school builds a positive relationships with parents, families, and stakeholders by having an open door policies, encouraging parents to learn about their child's success through parent informational PD sessions, and is creating a Parent & Family Engagement Plan through Title I. The school is encouraging

parent involvement and training by creating "Parent University" sessions at least one time per month. The sessions will teach parents how to support their child academically and in various other areas.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The social-emotional needs of all students are being met through the KNIGHTS of Excellence character train lessons and recognition program, as well as through counseling, positive behavior programs, mental health referrals/supports; check-in/check-out with students; behavior goal setting through daily progress reports; open communication with parents and all school-based stakeholders.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To support students' transition from one level to another, students create Personal Learning Plans (PLP) that require student data chats and cumulative folder review by school staff. Parents are invited to parent conference day to review the student PLP and speak with the teacher(s). Orientations are held prior to school starting to orient students to the grade level and school expectations. Meet & Greet, as well as, Open House is hosted by KGCS to involve parents/students in the positive transition from one level to the next. The child's mental health is also reviewed on the MSD disclosure forms completed and resources provided as needed through our mental health allocation.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

KGCS identifies areas of need and resources through school data and our strategic plan. Goals are set based on state accountability data and areas of growth and strength are identified. An action plan is created for improvement and the Curriculum Specialist team with CSUSA assist with aligning curriculum resources to student and teacher needs. Instructional Focus Calendars are created based on data and classroom walk throughs are conducted with specific feedback. The school based leadership team and team leads are responsible for implementing the above items. Common planning meetings are held with each team at a minimum of one time per week to create lessons and align resources.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

KGCS has implemented an elementary and middle school Student Government to promote partnerships with our school and community resources. During the 19-20 school year, KGCS is implementing the digital coursework towards industry certification and preparation starting in 6th grade.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Civics Proficiency	\$0.00
---	--------	------------------------------------	--------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: PrepWorks</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Edmentum Study Island - Grade 5, 8, Biology</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: iReady (\$23,752), Reading Plus (\$25,700) - \$49,452 Total</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Attendance Rate				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1142	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Student Incentives and awards</i>			
					Total:	\$0.00