Keys Gate Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

http://www.keyscharter.org/

Demographics

Principal: Corinne Armstrong

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 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%)
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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baez, Corinne	Principal	
Veras, Yudibeth	Assistant Principal	
Beltran, Sandra	Dean	
Barroso, Yadira	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/1/2014, Corinne Armstrong

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.*
1

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
120

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 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%)
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](#).	

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	173	164	196	226	223	211	233	215	237	0	0	0	0	1878
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	4	2	5	2	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	4	2	6	9	16	9	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	4	2	5	13	41	41	34	19	33	0	0	0	0	192
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	3	7	15	8	14	76	33	28	29	0	0	0	0	213
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	8	13	38	8	12	53	62	83	131	0	0	0	0	408

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	10	15	5	19	62	87	54	71	0	0	0	0	323

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	7	19	24	12	1	2	3	6	16	0	0	0	0	90
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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

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	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	8	3	4	12	5	7	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	8

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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**	
	(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	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%					
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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						

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
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
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%	0
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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 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?

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. Other specifically relating to Civics Proficiency

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

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	Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%	
Area of Focus Description and 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
Measurable Outcome:	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:	Yadira Barroso (925630@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 Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers and students in iReady / Reading Plus implementation, montoring 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	Yadira Barroso (925630@dadeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

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

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

The School Leadership team will address the schoolwide improvement priorities by implementing the following initiatives.
1. Integrating the 4 C's Professional Dev. & Coaching throughout the school year.
2. PD Planning with David Futch Leadership Team ongoing.
3. 4C's alignment with TFET Walk Through weekly.
4. DPP Goal alignment with the PLC groups monthly.

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.

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.

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: Other: Civics Proficiency				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
		Notes: USA Test Prep is purchased with Title I funds to support Social Science as well as Science, ELA and Math ($4,505).				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	General Fund		$0.00
		Notes: STEM Scopes curriculum is purchased for K-8 science classroom instruction ($148,300).				
	1140	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
		Notes: USA Test Prep is purchased with Title I funds to support Social Science as well as Science, ELA and Math ($4,505).				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%				$76,660.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$10,908.00
			Notes: Lexia ($10,908)			
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	General Fund		$23,752.00
			Notes: i-Ready ($23,752)			
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$31,230.00
			Notes: Spring Board ELA and Math ($31,230)			
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$10,770.00
			Notes: Vocabulary K-2 Resources and Pearson Phonics K-1 ($10,770)			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	239-Other	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
			Notes: Student Incentives Awards Attitude is Altitude (Social Emotional Learning) Student/ Teacher Supplies and Professional Development Total: $14,510			
					Total:	**$76,660.00**