

Monroe County School District

Key Largo School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Key Largo School

104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/573>

Demographics

Principal: Darren Pais E

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Key Largo School

104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/573>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	50%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Preparing All Students for Success in a Global Society

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Key Largo School community ignites innovative learning, fosters leadership, celebrates diversity, and inspires active citizenship.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lietaert, Laura	Principal	<p>Key Largo School has a shared leadership approach to decision making . A Building Level Planning Team (BLPT) is established with elected teachers representing K-2, 3-5, 6-8, Exceptional Student Education (ESE), and Support Staff. The BLPT is a problem-solving team that meets on a weekly basis to discuss and plan school-wide issues and events. The information is then delivered to each member's respective teams. Additionally, all coaches are part of the KLS Leadership Team. Kathy Caputo represents grades K-2. Wendi Sullivan represents grades 3-5. Veronika Valdes represents grades 6-8. Michele Barry represents the ESE department. Christina Martinez represents the Support Staff. Meghan Ryan, Guidance Counselor, provides input and information regarding socioemotional learning, attendance, and restorative practices. Tiffany Zepeda and Eva Brown, AVID site coordinators, ensure that the team maintains a focus on the AVID certification instrument.</p>
		<p>The Leadership Team is strategically integrated with stakeholders that represent all employees of the school in order to support instruction through a process of shared problem solving. The role of the Leadership Team is to systematically examine available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. The Leadership Team works collaboratively with teachers and parents to make informed important academic decisions and resolve problems and concerns as they arise.</p>
		<p>Laura Lietaert, Principal, along with Cheryl Conley and Darren Pais, Assistant Principals, share a common vision for the use of data-based decision making.</p>
		<p>Mark Leffler, Math Coach, Margret Kirkley, Literacy Coach, and MTSS Coaches Oksana Gilbertson, Maria Slawson, and April Applegate provide expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. This team also identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum, behavior assessment, and intervention approaches. They develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards, programs, model best practices and co-teach model lessons by identifying systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assisting with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students considered to be "at risk", and assisting in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis.</p>
Conley, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Pais, Darren	Assistant Principal	
Caputo, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barry, Michele	Teacher, ESE	
Sullivan, Wendi	Teacher, K-12	
Martinez, Christina	Administrative Support	
Leffler, Mark	Instructional Coach	
Kirkley, Margret	Instructional Coach	
Slawson, Maria	Teacher, K-12	
Valdes, Veronika	Teacher, K-12	
Ryan, Meghan	School Counselor	
Brown, Eva	Teacher, K-12	
Zepeda, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Blanche, Nicole	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/1/2014, Darren Pais E

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

4

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

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 .	

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	64	81	66	80	74	84	96	86	84	0	0	0	0	715
Attendance below 90 percent	16	14	10	9	12	28	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	11	17	24	15	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	1	4	15	9	11	9	0	0	0	0	50

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	71	88	80	81	89	95	87	99	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	11	9	12	12	9	9	5	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	3	3	4	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	19	27	23	19	0	0	0	0	111

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	1	6	4	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	4	8	12	8	3	15	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5

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	
Number of students enrolled	83	71	88	80	81	89	95	87	99	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	11	9	12	12	9	9	5	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	3	3	4	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	19	27	23	19	0	0	0	0	111

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	1	6	4	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	4	8	12	8	3	15	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5

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	62%	64%	61%	64%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	61%	59%	62%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	51%	54%	52%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	63%	66%	62%	67%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	58%	64%	59%	65%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	51%	52%	57%	56%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	67%	56%	56%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	85%	78%	83%	85%	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	70%	-11%	58%	1%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	68%	66%	2%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	62%	62%	0%	56%	6%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	57%	58%	-1%	52%	5%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
	2018	66%	64%	2%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	60%	6%	64%	2%
	2018	76%	64%	12%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	44%	66%	-22%	60%	-16%
	2018	50%	60%	-10%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
06	2019	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	65%	61%	4%	54%	11%
	2018	67%	62%	5%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	62%	61%	1%	46%	16%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	45%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	65%	-5%	53%	7%
	2018	60%	64%	-4%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	56%	-6%	48%	2%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	80%	1%	71%	10%
2018	82%	74%	8%	71%	11%
Compare		-1%			

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	93%	70%	23%	61%	32%
2018	97%	76%	21%	62%	35%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	33	55	56	33	54	47	22	47			
ELL	40	62	52	42	48	45	16				
BLK	39	46	40	32	42						
HSP	59	59	51	59	56	44	48	82	45		
WHT	69	65	71	72	66	42	66	86	47		
FRL	56	58	51	58	56	39	47	77	43		
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	28	46	48	37	57	56	45	60			
ELL	30	50	52	50	50	59					
BLK	39	52	50	45	54	38	8				
HSP	54	54	53	61	56	55	66	81	60		
MUL	50			50							
WHT	67	54	54	72	63	65	72	91	55		
FRL	54	52	53	60	56	54	59	81	58		
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	29	41	30	32	42	39	26	42			
ELL	13	38	40	20	62	60					
BLK	43	42		52	55						
HSP	60	62	47	61	64	56	47	78	69		

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
MUL	80			50							
WHT	70	64	63	77	69	56	70	92	73		
FRL	57	60	50	62	60	51	47	76	59		

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	60
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	599
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	65
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 with the lowest performance is our Black/African American Subgroup: ELA Achievement (39%) and Math Achievement (32%).
There is a need for culturally responsive awareness.
The students within this identified subgroup have attended multiple schools.
This is a small subgroup comprising 5.7% of the total population pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. The data is affected year to year by the percentage of students in the tested grade levels. For the 2019-2020 school year there are 30 students (3.5%) that comprise this subgroup in tested grade levels.

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

Lowest Quartile Growth in Math: 2018 55%, 2019 45%
Many of the students in the lowest quartile for mathematics are also in the lowest quartile for reading. The state statute requires that these students be placed in a remediation course for reading. The master schedule was built to meet the requirements of reading.

Science Performance Overall: 2018 65%, 2019 56%
While our fifth grade science performance remained the same as the previous year (60%), our eighth grade performance dropped 14 percentage points from 64% to 50%.
In 2016, this cohort of students had a science satisfactory level of 53% as fifth grade students.

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.

Math Lowest 25%-see factors above

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

The most improvement was shown in ELA achievement (59% to 62%) and learning gains (54% to 60%). In these same areas, SWD and EL students showed the most growth. SWD in ELA achievement increased from 28% to 33% and Learning Gains increased from 46% to 55%. EL in ELA achievement increased from 30% to 40% and Learning Gains 50% to 62%. We have focused our personnel resources in both of these areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Number of students in 5th grade (15) and 7th grade (11) with two or more indicators.

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

1. Black/African American Subgroup
2. Lowest 25% Math
3. Science Performance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This group was identified by state data as falling below 41% satisfactory, they scored 40% satisfactory. ELA achievement remained the same at 39%. There were drops in ELA learning gains from 52 percentage points to 46 percentage points and in ELA lowest quartile from 50 percentage points to 40 percentage points.
 Math achievement dropped from 45 percentage points to 32 percentage points and the math learning gains fell from 54 percentage points to 42 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome: This subgroup will increase from 40% to 45% satisfactory.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cheryl Conley (cheryl.conley@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Targeted Intervention through schoolwide use of AVID strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Targeted interventions are planned, carefully considered interventions that occur when students do not meet the grade level expectations that are necessary for academic progress.

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID strategies school-wide to incorporate teaching/learning methodologies in critical areas. WICOR provides a learning model that educators can use to guide students in comprehending concepts and articulating ideas at increasingly complex levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that fall into this subgroup and use APM in 3-8 fall and winter, STAR fall, winter and spring
2. Data coaches and leadership will analyze data, meet with teachers, teachers meet with students, then prioritize students within this subgroup to be invited to Jumpstart, Rising K Tutoring and Title I tutoring thus expanding the school day for targeted students and expand Title I tutoring and E/I Program to be more inclusive of mathematics.
3. Add Intensive Reading and Critical Thinking.
4. Modify roles of Reading Interventionists.
5. Increase Culturally Relevant Awareness and Teaching Strategies and provide a professional development for staff "Managing Today's Kids" Trauma Informed Education.

Person Responsible: Margret Kirkley (margret.kirkley@keysschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Lowest 25%
 Math performance in the lowest quartile dropped 10 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 from 55% to 45%. The most significant drops were in fourth and fifth grades (fourth grade down ten percentage points from 76% to 66% and fifth grade down six percentage points from 50% to 44%).
 While there was a ten percentage point drop in fourth grade (76% to 66%), they are still well above the district and state numbers of 51% and 52% respectively. Fifth grade was already below district and state levels and the drop in 2019 (50% to 44%) caused them to be further below those levels.

Measurable Outcome: This area will improve from 45% to 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Darren Pais (darren.pais@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of MFAS system and small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The MFAS system includes tasks and problems that teachers can implement with their students, and rubrics that help the teacher interpret students' responses. Students are asked to perform mathematical tasks, explain their reasoning, and justify their solutions.

Teachers then use rubrics for interpreting and evaluating student responses in order to differentiate instruction based on students' strategies. By understanding student thinking, instruction can be modified to improve student achievement of mathematical goals related to the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement MFAS in all grade levels and use APM in 3-8 fall and winter, STAR fall, winter and spring
2. Data coaches and leadership will analyze data, meet with teachers, teachers meet with students
3. Expand Title I tutoring, Jump Start, Rising K Tutoring and E/I Program to be more inclusive of mathematics.
4. District Support from Mathematics Curriculum Specialist.
5. Small group instruction in mathematics with fidelity.

Person Responsible Mark Leffler (mark.leffler@keysschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School-wide Writing Focus: The KLS AVID Site Team identified writing as a focus for the 2020-2021 school year based on data that shows students who score higher on writing are more likely to score satisfactory on the ELA statewide test. The site team used the state of Florida's Writing Rubrics to create schoolwide rubrics for untested grade levels. Teachers also learn about, utilize, and share writing strategies throughout all content areas.

AVID Professional Learning Modules will be presented to the staff throughout the 2020-2021 schoolyear.

Use of Learning Goals and Scales: KLS will continue to use learning goals and scales in all classrooms and within all academic areas. Learning Goals and scales focus teacher and student attention to a specific goal or target and allow teachers and students to track learning progress toward the desired target.

Science Overall Performance: The Science Overall Performance dropped from 65% satisfactory to 56%.

KLS plans to reach an achievement level of 65% on the Science 5 and Science 8 tests combined. KLS will increase teacher support from the district Science Curriculum Specialist through sharing resources and supporting teachers.

Social Emotional Learning: Students in grades K-3 will be universally screened for social-emotional wellness using the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA). Teachers will complete the ratings twice a year, once in October and again in February. Results come directly from the DESSA platform which integrates with Focus, our student information system (SIS). We will be able to use DESSA results, along with early warning system (EWS) data in Focus, to group students into tiers in order to receive the appropriate level of support. If MCSD starts out the year virtually due to COVID-19 the October date will still allow teachers approximately eight weeks to get to know their students before completing the screening, but our dates are flexible to allow more time if needed.

Students in grades 4-8 will be universally screened for social-emotional wellness using the Social-Emotional Health Survey (SEHS). Students will self-rate twice a year, once in October and again in February. Data will be exported from the SEHS platform and uploaded into our PowerBi platform for SIS integration. This will allow us to use SEHS and EWS data together to group students into tiers. The SEHS is available in Spanish to allow access to our English language learners and there is a read aloud option to allow access to our struggling readers and students with disabilities.

Safer Smarter Schools, Second Step, Project Wisdom, Purpose Prep and Signs of Suicide are all social-emotional learning curriculums that are integrated into school schedules. Lessons occur weekly in the classroom through a learning sequence and prescribed activities provided to the classroom teacher.

Say Something and Start with Hello are programs out of Sandy Hook Promise. Say Something and Start with Hello training is given to all students at the prescribed grade levels by members of the SAVE Promise Club. Each school has an established SAVE Promise Club that conducts the school-wide trainings and holds meetings and activities throughout the school year to promote the lessons. Say Something teaches students to recognize signs that someone may be a threat to themselves or others and how to respond. Start with Hello is a program aimed at reducing social isolation among the student population.

Every classroom in grades K-8 received a calm down box that contains evidence-based materials to help students reduce anger, frustrations and other negative emotions that interfere in learning and positive social-emotional development. Materials contained in the box are related to stress reduction and mindfulness practices. The purpose of the box remaining in the classroom is to

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

KLS strives to engage community stakeholders to connect community experts with our school. Staff participate in community events to connect the school and community. These events include: team building at Key Largo Chocolates, Key Largo Annual Witches Ride, Relay for Life, Irish Festival, Community Band, highway cleanup, McTeacher Night and others.

AHEC and the Florida Department of Health - Monroe County offer coordinated levels of school-based healthcare to the students at Key Largo School and their families which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds. AHEC services reduce barriers to care, connect eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provide care for students who are not eligible for other services. Local agencies such as AHEC and Monroe County Health Department offer a coordinated level of school-based health care that integrates education, medical, and/or social services at the school site. This partnership provides educational services such as Showdown in Tothtown, Bone Zone, Walk through the Heart, and Scruba-Bubba. An AHEC grant allows KLS to have a physician's assistant on campus three days a week to provide care for children and staff. Other community partnerships include Key Largo Rotary Club, Ocean Reef Community Foundation, Keys Children's Foundation, Island Dolphin Care, First State Bank, Center State Bank, Centennial Bank, Dolphins Cove, Publix, United Way and Take Stock in Children.

KLS involves parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extends an open invitation to the school's parent resource area to inform parents about available programs and their rights under ESSA and other referral services. We aim to increase parent engagement/involvement through developing KLS Title I compact, KLS Title I Parent Involvement Plan, scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting, and other documents/activities in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements. Informal parent surveys are conducted to determine specific parental needs.

Annual Events Include:

Meet the Teacher

AVID/Title I/Open House/Student Success Nights

Hispanic Heritage Food Truck Night

Halloween Parade/Spooktacular

Book Fairs

Dads Take your Child to School Day

Thanksgiving Feast

Veterans Day/Patriot Day Ceremonies

Conch Scramble

- Holiday Breakfasts
- Canned Food Drives
- Concerts/Assemblies
- Fish Fry
- Fun Run
- World Heritage/AVID STEAM Fair Night
- Fine Arts Festival
- Earth/Career Days

The PBIS Team at Key Largo School works closely with classroom teachers to ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are met. Our guidance counselors provide targeted counseling groups, individual counseling, consultation with parents/caregivers, and referrals to community resources based on the needs of our students. The guidance counselors also work directly with students to teach and practice problem solving techniques. Pupil services include school social worker, CINS/FINS, Wesley House, CHIPS, KISS, Kids Come First, and referrals to Guidance Care Clinic, if necessary. MTSS Coordinator and administration hold monthly meetings to track trends and provide support for emotional needs. MTSS team has access to a behavior specialist to assist as needed. Growth Mindset training was provided to all teachers by the MTSS team. This is reinforced at faculty meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00