

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Keys Gate Charter School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

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

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 11/30/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 11/30/2021.

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,905

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.

7

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	186	187	189	208	223	223	240	228	221	0	0	0	0	1905
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	3	2	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	5	2	4	18	7	4	7	16	10	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	5	6	7	13	7	10	4	19	27	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	88	48	62	50	57	0	0	0	0	351
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	69	92	72	102	69	109	0	0	0	0	513
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	3	8	18	17	16	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	110

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	6	4	10	22	15	17	25	23	28	0	0	0	0	150

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		5	2	4	18	7	4	7	8	27	0	0	0	82
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	2	3	1	5	3	7	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/17/2021

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

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	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	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
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	

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				54%	63%	61%	57%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	61%	59%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	57%	54%	58%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				65%	67%	62%	64%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				64%	63%	59%	64%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	56%	52%	48%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				45%	56%	56%	52%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	80%	78%	67%	79%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	64%	-11%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2021					
	2019	45%	56%	-11%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	69%	-11%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	65%	6%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2021					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	57%	40%	17%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	68%	29%	67%	30%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	54%	46%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All students will be progressed monitored through Monthly IFA's and NWEA and i-Ready 3 times a year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	NA	48	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	40	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	32	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	32	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	NA	55	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	49	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	28	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	32	NA

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	NA	56	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	50	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	39	NA
	English Language Learners		40	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	NA	35	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	30	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	21	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	29	NA
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62	59	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	52	58
	Students With Disabilities	38	43	45
	English Language Learners	22	52	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60	53	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	20	39	31
	English Language Learners	49	46	49

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62	53	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	43	41
	Students With Disabilities	29	10	19
	English Language Learners	35	19	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	40	41
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	15
	English Language Learners	52	20	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	54	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	54	51
	Students With Disabilities	15	49	40
	English Language Learners	26	38	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65	53	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	50	41
	Students With Disabilities	10	13	20
	English Language Learners	51	43	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	57	52	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	11	43	40
	English Language Learners	24	51	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	55	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	50	41
	Students With Disabilities	23	38	32
	English Language Learners	29	40	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	43	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	40	32
	Students With Disabilities	17	33	29
	English Language Learners	38	40	34
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	59	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	50	40
	Students With Disabilities	26	32	26
	English Language Learners	50	48	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	31	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	30	20
	Students With Disabilities	26	16	10
	English Language Learners	30	29	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	65	61	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	53	70
	Students With Disabilities	49	47	49
	English Language Learners	56	59	59

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	53	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	50	42
	Students With Disabilities	37	42	36
	English Language Learners	54	40	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	21	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	19	30
	Students With Disabilities	20	6	10
	English Language Learners	20	11	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	62	55	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	51	50
	Students With Disabilities	40	47	40
	English Language Learners	59	50	53

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	15	32	28	13	16	18	20	32			
ELL	36	46	38	25	23	30	24	41	29		
ASN	64			18							
BLK	43	36	21	30	22	13	25	42	35		
HSP	47	43	37	36	22	23	34	55	42		
MUL	38	21		27	7						
WHT	68	56	10	59	31	20	48	85	80		
FRL	45	41	31	33	21	22	32	52	42		
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		

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
BLK	48	49	39	58	56	43	34	65	35		
HSP	54	53	48	65	65	53	45	65	67		
MUL	54	30		77	60						
WHT	65	61	60	76	77	71	63	65	71		
FRL	51	52	47	62	63	52	42	64	60		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	39	38	21	40	36	11	15			
ELL	35	55	61	46	61	51	27	40			
ASN	73	70		73	60						
BLK	41	48	44	49	51	35	25	70			
HSP	58	62	61	65	65	51	53	63	76		
MUL	57	58		86	92						
WHT	73	64	69	74	68	64	76	74	78		
FRL	54	59	58	64	64	48	53	59	71		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	35

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	41
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	23
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	51
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The trends that emerged across grade levels and subgroups were low learning gains and low achievement scores (compared to previous years data) in all core subjects.

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

Based off progress monitoring and prior year assessments, the greatest need for improvement are in the subjects of Mathematics and the Sciences.

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 low proficiency numbers across the school in the Sciences and Mathematics are the reason why the following action plan will need to be implemented:

Allocated 30 minutes of Tiered DI intervention to all students in grades K-8 in Mathematics

Implementing Science centers and incorporating weekly labs

Implementation of rigorous lesson planning and standards alignment

Monitoring and incentivizing students for effectively using iReady, Imagine Math, Study Island

Starting tutoring in October to ensure students are receiving all the support they need to close the learning gap

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

N/A. Our data went down in every subject when compared to the 2019 data.

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

N/A

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

Tiered Differentiated Instruction for all 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.

The professional development that will be offered to teachers to prepared them with the tools needed to accelerate learning are:

Differentiation

Small Groups/Centers

Instructional Software

TLC

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are:

Hiring of external tutoring company

Math Intervention

Continuous implementation of Reading Intervention

Tiered Differentiated Instruction

Continuous Professional Development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency and learning gains in the Mathematics subject area. - Low proficiency and learning gains from the 2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Our data based objectives are to achieve 46% proficiency in Math and 57% in math learning gains.
Monitoring:	30 minutes of tiered differentiated intervention for all students in Math Continues and effective use of iReady and Imagine Math Rigorous lesson planning and standards alignment Tutoring- including hiring external tutors to target student needs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yudibeth Veras (933033@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tiered differentiated instruction targets specific student needs allowing teachers to close the learning gap. Nordlund, M. (2003). Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be tiered and grouped based on ability level (standards based) achieved in monthly assessment. Students will travel to a teacher where instruction will take place based on the students ability (remediation or enrichment can be taking place depending on student need). We are calling this period of time where tiered differentiation will be taken place "Success Block". A pre and post assessment will be taking place to ensure students are mastering the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Pre and Post assessments will be created by Curriculum Resource Teachers
 Pre and Post assessments will be tracked by teachers
 Teachers will group students based on ability level
 Curriculum resource teachers will guide teachers in the lesson planning and instruction process for "Success Block"
 Groups will change monthly based on students scores on the monthly assessments.

Person Responsible Yudibeth Veras (933033@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase student proficiency in all Science exams. - Low scores in science proficiency in the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The school's data based objective is to achieve 50% proficiency.
Monitoring:	Implementation of weekly engaging and hands on labs Continues and effective use of Study Island Rigorous lesson planning with standards alignment and vocabulary focus Tutoring- including hiring external tutors to target student needs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yadira Barroso (925630@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tiered differentiated instruction for all students in Science Nordlund, M. (2003). Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be tiered and grouped based on ability level (standards based) achieved in monthly assessment. Students will travel to a teacher where instruction will take place based on the students ability (remediation or enrichment can be taking place depending on student need). We are calling this period of time where tiered differentiation will be taken place "Success Block". A pre and post assessment will be taking place to ensure students are mastering the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Pre and Post assessments will be created by Curriculum Resource Teachers
 Pre and Post assessments will be tracked by teachers
 Teachers will group students based on ability level
 Curriculum resource teachers will guide teachers in the lesson planning and instruction process for "Success Block"
 Groups will change monthly based on students scores on the monthly assessments.

Person Responsible Yadira Barroso (925630@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: To increase learning gains in ELA. - Low learning gains in ELA in the 20-21 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Our data based objective is to increase our ELA learning gains to 59%

Monitoring: Continues and effective use of iReady
RTI Process
Focus on instructional minutes
Rigorous lesson planning with standards alignment and a focus on tiered differentiated instruction
Tutoring- including hiring external tutors to target student needs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tiered differentiated instruction targets specific student needs allowing teachers to close the learning gap and students achieving learning gains.
Nordlund, M. (2003). Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be tiered and grouped based on ability level (standards based) achieved in monthly assessment. Teacher will see students on teacher led daily where instruction will take place based on the students ability (remediation or enrichment can be taking place depending on student need).

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher will provide Tier 2 intervention
Intervention teachers will pull Tier 3 students for them to receive T3 intervention
Pre and Post assessments will be created by Curriculum Resource Teachers
Pre and Post assessments will be tracked by teachers
Teachers will group students based on ability level
Curriculum resource teachers will guide teachers in the lesson planning process for teacher lead and differentiated instruction process
Groups will change monthly based on students scores on the monthly assessments.

Person Responsible Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase proficiency in Social Sciences. - Low proficiency scores in the 20-21 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Our data based objective is to achieve 70% proficiency

Rigorous lesson planning and standards alignment
Standards Tracking

Monitoring: Integration of Civic standards in 6th grade
Purchase Gateway to American Government to implement curriculum
Tutoring- including hiring external tutors to target student needs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Yadira Barroso (925630@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows a positive correlation between standards tracking and proficiency. Mohamud A. & Fleck D. (2010) Alignment of Standards, Assessment and Instruction: Implications for English Language Learners in Ohio, Theory Into Practice, 49(2), 129-136, <https://doi.org.10.1080/00405841003626643>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards tracking allows for teachers to target the standards that each individual student is struggling with. Standards tracking guides teachers in aligning instruction with the standard and the assessment, targeting instruction and increasing proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Rigorous lesson planning and standards alignment
Standards Tracking
Integration of Civic standards in 6th grade
Purchase Gateway to American Government to implement curriculum
Tutoring- including hiring external tutors to target student needs

Person Responsible Yudideth Veras (933033@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The school will be implementing the behavior program called HERO. The goal is to effectively use this program to incentivize and reward students for their good behavior while tracking their negative behavior. As a school, the goal is to minimize school suspensions. By using HERO we will be able to monitor and address the behavior of all students (positive or negative) in a platform accessible to all stakeholders. By implementing the HERO program and rewarding good behavior, we will be able to improve the school's culture.

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.

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

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

The school is encouraging parental involvement and training by holding "Parent University" sessions at least once a month. The sessions will teach parents how to support their child academically, emotionally and other areas.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$50,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2400	160-Other Support Personnel	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$50,000.00
			<i>Notes: External Tutors</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$55,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2400	160-Other Support Personnel	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$50,000.00
			<i>Notes: External Tutors</i>			
	2400	500-Materials and Supplies	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Science lab materials</i>			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$50,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2400	160-Other Support Personnel	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other Federal		\$50,000.00
			<i>Notes: External Tutors</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2400	520-Textbooks	3610 - Keys Gate Charter School	Other		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase Gateway to American Government</i>			
Total:						\$157,000.00