Keystone Heights Junior/ Senior High

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khh.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Burke

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Clay 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

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khh.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant; which transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KHHS exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burke, Laurie	Principal	School Instructional Leader: Science
Underwood, Barry	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader: Social Studies
Conneely, Tanza	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader: Math
Cowper, Donald	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader: Language Arts

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Laurie Burke

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
81

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,250

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	224	180	219	228	163	1250
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	15	15	20	6	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	6	9	8	6	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	5	4	7	7	2	28

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	230	218	177	199	171	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	37	65	39	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	13	13	7	6	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95

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	19	15	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	230	218	177	199	171	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	37	65	39	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	13	13	7	6	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95

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	19	15	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	60%	56%	50%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	52%	51%	48%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	39%	42%	37%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				59%	55%	51%	59%	55%	51%
Math Learning Gains				49%	46%	48%	60%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	38%	45%	53%	36%	45%
Science Achievement				58%	73%	68%	63%	92%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				70%	81%	73%	66%	79%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	54%	59%	-5%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
09	2021					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
10	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	65%	63%	2%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	66%	72%	-6%	67%	-1%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	80%	-15%	71%	-6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	80%	-3%	70%	7%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	64%	1%	57%	8%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Testing results.

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			43.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			38.3
	Students With Disabilities			48.5
	English Language Learners			0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			100
	Economically Disadvantaged			100
	Students With Disabilities			100
	English Language Learners			100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			91.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			87.5
	Students With Disabilities			93.8
	English Language Learners			91.5

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			51.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			38.4
	Students With Disabilities			59.6
	English Language Learners			0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			84.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			85.4
	English Language Learners			84.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			50.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			42.9
	Students With Disabilities			57.8
	English Language Learners			50.3

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			47.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			40.0
	Students With Disabilities			53.3
	English Language Learners			47.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			24.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			15.0
	Students With Disabilities			30.3
	English Language Learners			24.3
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			77.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			75.0
	Students With Disabilities			80.2
	English Language Learners			77.7
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			45.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			37.5
	Students With Disabilities			53.4
	English Language Learners			45.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			21.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			17.5
	Students With Disabilities			27.9
	English Language Learners			21.3
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			64.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			63.0
	Students With Disabilities			71.3
	English Language Learners			64.5
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			71.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			68.1
	Students With Disabilities			78.4
	English Language Learners			71.4

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners			0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			87.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			0
	Students With Disabilities			92.9
	English Language Learners			87.9

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	31	26	22	29	28	28	42	16	87	33
BLK	38	32	20	22	10		36				
HSP	42	43		29	37		47	67	30	90	
MUL	36	32		67	50		33				
WHT	47	38	29	49	37	27	60	72	50	93	70

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
FRL	38	32	25	39	36	23	52	70	34	87	57

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	24	41	32	27	41	38	32	40		91	41
BLK	25	35	30	53	62		46				
HSP	45	63	70	50	54		67	92			
MUL	30	60		47	44		19				
WHT	54	51	42	60	48	38	59	70	72	91	72
FRL	42	48	45	56	47	42	51	60	70	90	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	21	37	34	32	47	44	43	33		67	50
BLK	41	63		36	33			50			
HSP	41	44	36	51	53	64	40	76			
MUL	30	32		40	63			50			
WHT	51	48	37	61	60	53	63	67	67	86	66
FRL	44	47	39	52	56	56	54	63	67	74	53

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Math showed the largest drop moving from 59% achievement in 2019 to 47% achievement in 2021. The major factor would be the unstable nature of the COVID-influenced learning environment as students were in and out of session and/or learning virtually.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

KHH 7th grade math scores were at 25%, which is well behind both the district score of 37% and the state average of 44%. The seventh grade math rate was 65% in 2019, which constitutes a 40% decrease when compared to the 25% from 2021.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The major factor would be the unstable nature of the COVID-influenced learning environment as students were in and out of session and/or learning virtually, particularly when students are transitioning from the more structure elementary environment to the Jr/Sr high school model.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Eighth grade math showed a significant increase from a rate of 46% in 2019 to a rate of 57% in 2021. The 57% rate was above the district average at 50% and well above the state average at 37%.

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

Students already one year of experience on a traditional Jr/Sr high school schedule, and the staff members responsible for teaching the content were veteran teachers with a great deal of experience both with the content and with testing expectations.

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

Using available resources such as IXL, Achieve3000, Savvas, PLCs, and the new B.E.S.T Standards, our math team will attempt to increase the rigor of delivered math lessons by guiding students to engage more deeply with the material and not by simply increasing the amount of material dispersed to students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our PLCs focus this year centers around rigor and defining what that looks like for each content area (math, English, science, social studies, etc.) with a strong emphasis on the importance of diving deeper into the material and not just assigning more material.

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

-IXL
-Savvas
-iReady
-PLC modeling and reflection
-B.E.S.T. Standards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA achievement dropped from 52% in 2019 to 47% in 2021, ELA learning gains (LG) dropped from 52% in 2019 to 38% in 2021, and ELA LG Lowest 25% dropped from 45% in 2019 to 30% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement will increase from 47% in 2021 to 49% in 2022 ELA learning gains (LG) will increase from 38% in 2021 to 40% in 2022, and ELA LG Lowest 25% will increased from 30% in 2021 to 32% in 2022. Increase proficiency in ELA by 3% for the multi racial subgroup resulting in an increase from 40%to 43%.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through data review of Achieve 3000, and Savvas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Cowper (donald.cowper@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-IXL -Achieve3000 -Savvas -PLC modeling and reflection -B.E.S.T. Standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using available resources such as IXL, Achieve3000, Savvas, PLCs, and the new B.E.S.T Standards, our ELA team will attempt to increase the rigor of delivered ELA lessons by guiding students to engage more deeply with the material and not by simply increasing the amount of material dispersed to students.

Action Steps to Implement

-IXL
-Achieve3000
-Savvas
-PLC modeling and reflection
-B.E.S.T. Standards

Person Responsible	Donald Cowper (donald.cowper@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math achievement dropped from 59% in 2019 to 47% in 2021, math learning gains (LG) dropped from 49% in 2019 to 36% in 2021, and math LG Lowest 25% dropped from 49% in 2019 to 24% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Math achievement will increase from 47% in 2021 to 49% in 2022, math learning gains (LG) will increase from 36% in 2021 to 38% in 2022, and math LG Lowest 25% will increased from 24% in 2021 to 26% in 2022.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through data review of IXL and Iready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tanza Conneely (tanza.conneely@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-IXL -Savvas -iReady -PLC modeling and reflection -B.E.S.T. Standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using available resources such as IXL, Achieve3000, Savvas, PLCs, and the new B.E.S.T Standards, our math team will attempt to increase the rigor of delivered math lessons by guiding students to engage more deeply with the material and not by simply increasing the amount of material dispersed to students.

Action Steps to Implement

-IXL
-Savvas
-iReady
-PLC modeling and reflection
-B.E.S.T. Standards

Person Responsible	Tanza Conneely (tanza.conneely@myoneclay.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Mental Health	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through active collaboration with our Community Partnership School (CPS) team, we are looking to increase our 2021-2022 wellness support totals from the 2020-2021 wellness support totals in the following categories: -Number of scheduled dental appointments -Number of scheduled vision appointments -Number of scheduled health care appointments -Number of Behavioral Health Service Referrals received -Number of students receiving mental and behavioral health services -Number of unduplicated students utilizing the washers/dryers -Total Number of visits to use laundry services
Measurable Outcome:	Keystone Heights High School 2021-2022 wellness support totals will show a 10% or greater increase from the 2020-2021 wellness support totals in the following categories: -Number of scheduled dental appointments -Number of scheduled vision appointments -Number of scheduled health care appointments -Number of Behavioral Health Service Referrals received -Number of students receiving mental and behavioral health services -Number of unduplicated students utilizing the washers/dryers -Total Number of visits to use laundry services
Monitoring:	Appointment data will be reviewed quarterly to determine success of each of our wellness appointments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Cowper (donald.cowper@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Keystone 20-21 Goals Scorecard -Keystone 21-22 Goals Scorecard -CPS Team -KHH Admin Team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By collaborating across the school via the CPS and Admin Teams, we will track the increases in student wellness support services provided to students to determine if we met our goal of a 10% or greater increase across the categories listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

-Keystone 20-21 Goals Scorecard
-Keystone 21-22 Goals Scorecard
-CPS Team
-KHH Admin Team

Person Responsible	Donald Cowper (donald.cowper@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Keystone Heights High School ranks #497 out of 505 schools with an incident rate of 8.77 per 100 students.

Evidence-based strategy:
-Positive Behavior Incentive Programs, Indian Bucks used with the Trading Post to reward students on campus.
-7 Mindsets training for students and teachers.

Rationale for evidence-based strategy:
-Positive Behavior Incentive Programs encourage positive behaviors by rewarding students for improved and appropriate behaviors. This goal will be achieved if the incident rate per 100 students drops below 8.00 incidents per 100 students.

Action steps to implement:
1. Explain PBIS (Indian Bucks) to Faculty and Students.
2. Continue to create community partners to help assist with Trading Post Incentives.
3. Recognize Students for Positive behaviors and give them Indian Bucks.
4. Students and Teachers are participating in 7 mindsets to address mindset changes and overcoming obstacles.

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.

Keystone Heights Jr/Sr High School will continue to address building a positive school culture and environment in a number of ways including, but limited to, the following:

1. PBIS (positive behavior incentive programs) Rewards: Students exhibiting desired positive behaviors are rewarded with Indian Bucks that can used at the Trading Post to exchange for reward items.

2. Seven Mindsets: Students and staff will continue to engage in Seven Mindsets training to help promote a healthy, happy learning environment for all stakeholders.

3. CPS (community partnership school) Team: Keystone Heights will continue to grow and develop our relationship with our CPS Team as we work toward full UCF certification. The CPS Team will continue to work to procure health opportunities (health, dental, vision, mental health appointments) and other services for both students and stakeholders in need.

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

Through active collaboration with our Community Partnership School (CPS) team, we are looking to increase our 2021-2022 wellness support totals from the 2020-2021 wellness support totals in the following categories:

-Number of scheduled dental appointments
-Number of scheduled vision appointments
-Number of scheduled health care appointments
-Number of Behavioral Health Service Referrals received
-Number of students receiving mental and behavioral health services
-Number of unduplicated students utilizing the washers/dryers
-Total Number of visits to use laundry services

Keystone Heights will continue to partner with Sante Fe to provide students with dual credit/advanced training opportunities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Mental Health**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**