

Monroe County School District

Key Largo School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Key Largo School

104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

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

Demographics

Principal: Darren Pais E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Key Largo School

104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Working together to inspire and bring excellence to every student every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive passionately to create healthy, happy, and engaged students who are successful and productive.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pais, Darren	Principal	
Ward, Debra	Assistant Principal	
Fisher, Hannah	Assistant Principal	
Castillo, Lissette	Instructional Coach	
Leffler, Mark	Math Coach	
Blanche, Nicole	School Counselor	
Kerns, Carrie	School Counselor	
Zepeda, Tiffany	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Darren Pais E

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	63	62	75	86	68	70	79	88	89	0	0	0	0	680	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	9	17	11	9	17	15	12	0	0	0	0	120	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	6	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	13	18	25	26	22	0	0	0	0	110	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	11	21	26	21	22	0	0	0	0	106	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	24	0	0	0	0	66	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	8	4	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	40	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Friday 9/16/2022

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	65	69	79	73	75	76	89	102	90	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	19	22	13	18	13	15	20	6	12	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	23	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	29	39	22	20	0	0	0	0	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	11	23	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	91

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	1	0	6	4	15	22	11	8	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	65	69	79	73	75	76	89	102	90	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	19	22	13	18	13	15	20	6	12	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	23	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	29	39	22	20	0	0	0	0	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	11	23	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	91

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	1	0	6	4	15	22	11	8	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	54%	55%				62%	64%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						60%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						56%	51%	54%
Math Achievement	53%	38%	42%				63%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains	61%						58%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						45%	51%	52%
Science Achievement	47%	57%	54%				56%	67%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	63%	59%				81%	85%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	70%	-11%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2022					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	66%	-22%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2022					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
07	2022					
	2019	65%	61%	4%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	62%	61%	1%	46%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	65%	-5%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	48%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	80%	1%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	70%	23%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	69%	-69%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	16	29	33	28	41	39	13	52			
ELL	22	34	34	33	54	58	19				
BLK	33	48		29	43	30					
HSP	42	43	39	48	60	55	36	68	73		
MUL	50	55		50	42						
WHT	60	48	28	64	68	50	59	79	56		
FRL	43	43	38	45	56	47	40	67	62		
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	27	24	25	32	31	23	50			
ELL	27	38	33	29	41	39	17				
BLK	33	25		33	50						
HSP	48	49	35	45	49	43	43	79	58		
WHT	58	43	33	58	48	50	57	90	61		
FRL	43	42	29	41	45	38	47	79	56		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	55	56	33	54	47	22	47			
ELL	40	62	52	42	48	45	16				
BLK	39	46	40	32	42						
HSP	59	59	51	59	56	44	48	82	45		
WHT	69	65	71	72	66	42	66	86	47		
FRL	56	58	51	58	56	39	47	77	43		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	49
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	57
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

After reviewing the data, stakeholders correlated reading deficiencies such as the inability to annotate, analyze text, make text-to-text connections, and demonstrate the ability to apply analytical skills to broader concepts. Stakeholders believe that placing a greater emphasis on reading across the curriculum and implementing an array of effective reading strategies in all content classes, can help address this deficit. The evident trends across math were that students struggled to move from basic computational skills and number concepts to more complex ideas and mathematical reasoning, including problem-solving.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2021-22 school year was ELA achievement. There were several factors that contributed to this performance. Students across grades 3 through 8 showed deficiencies with the following reading foundations: phonics, syntax, phonology, analysis of key ideas and details, and integrating knowledge and ideas.

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 data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA achievement which fell by 9%. One of the contributing factors to this decline is the fact that 167 students had an attendance rate below 90%, based on the most recent EWS report. After reviewing the data, stakeholders correlated reading deficiencies such as the inability to annotate and analyze text, make text-to-text connections, and the ability to apply analysis to broader concepts that contributed to this gap. We will focus on implementing standards-based instruction in all classrooms with an emphasis on our at-risk student subgroup (MTSS). We will also offer professional development for teachers using strategies that focus on WICOR and intervention for lower-performing students to help them access grade-level content. We will be strategic with aligning resources and include continuous progress monitoring (STAR and FAST assessments) in our data chats.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

4th Grade ELA
5th Grade ELA
3rd Grade Math
5th Grade Math
Algebra

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

Teachers participated in collaborative planning with grade levels and the math and literacy coaches. We have highly qualified teachers with excellent content knowledge and research-based teaching strategies. Each grade level receives support from a designated ESE support facilitator and paraprofessional daily.

Continuing Actions:

AVID/WICOR training for new and returning staff members
CTE Pathways to Certification

New Actions:

Aligning IEP Smart Goals with BEST Standards
AVID in Action collaborative community
AVID Elementary and Secondary Critical Reading and Writing
BEST Math training for 3-5
Everglades Literacy Project and DBQ Project Grades K-5
Everglades Literacy Project and Guy Harvey Grades 6-12
SAAVAS Math Grades K-5
SAAVAS Perspectives and iLit 45 training for ELA

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

Restructure Interventionist Model to include intensive math and reading classes.
Restructure Support Facilitation Model to provide specialized support for at-risk students in every grade level.
Paraprofessionals are assigned to each grade level as additional support.

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.

Continuing Professional Development:

AVID Summer Institute
AVID/WICOR training for new and returning staff members
CTE Pathways to Certification
Phonics First/Orton Gillingham training from BrainSpring
Support Facilitation/ Co-Teaching Professional Learning

New Professional Development:

Aligning IEP Smart Goals with BEST Standards
AVID in Action collaborative community
AVID Elementary and Secondary Critical Reading and Writing
BEST Math training for 3-5
Everglades Literacy Project and DBQ Project Grades K-5
Everglades Literacy Project and Guy Harvey Grades 6-12

SAAVAS Math Grades K-5

SAAVAS Perspectives and iLit 45 training for ELA

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

Restructure of interventionists in the elementary and middle school schedules. Professional development for teachers on math and reading interventions, AVID strategies, and the BIG-M, including tiered instruction.

Middle school schedule reform to provide a schedule that meets individual needs of our students; increase student engagement and create a culturally inclusive community.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Panorama Universal Screener was administered twice to the K-2 teachers and the 3-8 students in the 21-22 school year. The screeners were used to determine if students have particular needs or are considered high risk. Based on the results, for grades 3-5, Grit is the attribute that falls into one of our areas for improvement. This refers to the ability of the students to persevere through setbacks to achieve significant long-term goals.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

With consistent positive reinforcement and improved student-teacher relationships, after the second 2022-23 Panorama Universal Screener our Student Grit risk level will be equal to or higher than the current district's average of 56% for grades 3-5, and 50% for grades 6-8.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Panorama will be used in the 22-23 school year to review the screener data and address Healthy Living Initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Kerns (carrie.kerns@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

In an effort to successfully address the targeted element of Student Grit, our school will engage in activities aligned with PBIS that will contribute to improved student perceptions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

PBIS methods are research-based and proven to significantly reduce the occurrence of problem behaviors in the school setting by reinforcing desired behaviors at school. Our PBIS team will discuss and implement strategies from the Panorama Playbook to reinforce grit and increase academic performance.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify grade levels that exhibit low grit based on the Panorama Universal Screener.
2. Restructure activities and incentives based on student and staff inventory results.
2. Continue with PBIS monthly meetings to plan and disseminate information to grade-level teams.

Person Responsible

Carrie Kerns (carrie.kerns@keysschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our ELL, ESE, Black/African American subgroups are below the ESSA Federal Index whereas all other subgroups have been above the ESSA Federal Index. In 2022 in Math, 33% of ELL students, 41% of ESE students, and 29% of our Black/African American students were proficient. That same year, in ELA, 22% of ELL students, 16% of ESE students, and 33% of our Black/African American students were proficient.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to raise the learning gains of ELL, ESE, and Black/African American students to 56% in both Math and ELA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor student progress through the STAR and FAST assessments; Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hannah Fisher (hannah.fisher@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Targeted interventions will be implemented through school-wide use of AVID Strategies in the classroom; inquiry, gradual release, tiered instruction, collaboration, and organizational strategies. Students will be provided opportunities for intervention through Title I after-school tutoring, morning tutoring, and English Intervention classes. The use of evidence-based strategies Explicit Instruction, Systematic Instruction, Scaffolded Instruction, Corrective Feedback, and Differentiated Instruction. Implementation of these strategies will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Implementation of the five Core Components of RAISE combined with research-based AVID strategies will enhance instruction to improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify students that fall into this subgroup.
2. Prioritize students within this subgroup to be invited to early morning tutoring and/or after-school Title I tutoring, thus expanding the school day for identified students.
3. Modify roles and schedules of Interventionists.
4. District Support from ELA Curriculum Specialist.

Person Responsible Lissette Castillo (lissette.castillo@keysschools.com)

1. Identify students that fall into this subgroup.
2. Prioritize students within this subgroup to be invited to early morning tutoring and/or after-school Title I tutoring, thus expanding the school day for identified students.
3. Modify roles and schedules of Interventionists.
4. District Support from Mathematics Curriculum Specialist.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on our EOY STAR Reading Screening (2021-2022), our 2nd grade scored at 57% proficient overall. We are most in need of improvement for our EL students, who scored at 27% proficient overall. We intend to use multi-sensory instruction with Heggerty Phonics to build word-level skills with this group of students. This will lead to growth in fluency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The area of focus is 78% of the African American students in grades 4 and 5 are below proficiency. Based on this result, it is clear that the delivery of a comprehension strategy is necessary for these students to become successful with reading. Classroom Discussion is a research-based strategy that uses frequent pair-share activities and collaborative learning styles to increase engagement and cognition with an effect size of 0.82 on Hattie's Visible Learning Model. Scaffolded instruction is a well-

established and research-based instructional practice with a 0.82 effect size in Hattie's analysis of classroom effect sizes. It enables students to achieve results with intentional and sequential steps.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades K-1 will use STAR Early Literacy to assess proficiency. Grade 2 will use STAR Reading to assess proficiency. All students K-2 will demonstrate 60% proficiency or greater by the Spring progress monitoring assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the results of the 2022 ELA FSA, overall proficiency in grades 3-5 in the areas of English Language Arts will increase to 70% proficiency or greater by the Spring progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The success of Heggerty Phonemic Awareness will be measured, our K-2 students, through the data analyzed and collected during the school year, including progress monitoring data. We expect to see a gradual growth of 20%, of our proficiency target, per quarter. If growth is stagnated or negative we will alter our instructional strategies to meet the needs of students and achieve our proficiency goal. We will utilize teacher observations and walkthrough data to monitor the fidelity of the targeted instructional strategy. A blended approach of Orton-Gillingham and differentiated instruction will be utilized for grades 3-5. This approach's effectiveness will be monitored by evaluating data for targeted students in these grade levels. Walkthroughs and classroom observations should reflect the successful implementation of differentiated instruction. Target students' data will be monitored quarterly and instruction will be reassessed to determine the level of tiered instruction required to achieve the targeted proficiency level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ward, Debra, debra.ward@keysschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

K-2 students will utilize Heggerty Phonemic Awareness to refine phonemic skills. Teachers will instruct students how to associate meanings with sounds through; decoding, writing, and analyzing words and word parts. This engagement will promote phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The basic evidence-based strategies listed are the building blocks for K-2 students to form a sustained relationship with ELA. The strategies fully align with the B.E.S.T Standards and the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan.

Students in grades 3-5 will use a blended approach the Orton-Gillingham strategies and differentiated instruction. This will create a differentiated and targeted approach to meet the need of each student. Hattie has identified response to intervention as a high-yield strategy with an effect size of 1.09. This blend of strategies is aligned with the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, and the B.E.S.T Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Our EL students scored at 27% proficient overall. We will use multi-sensory instruction with Heggerty Phonics to build word-level skills. This will lead to growth in fluency. The intentional use of Heggerty Phonics directly addresses our need for improving word-level skills. Heggerty Phonics is especially effective with EL students. It gives structure to language acquisition in a way that students can understand. 78% of the African American students in grades 4 and 5 are below proficiency. Classroom Discussion is a research-based strategy that uses frequent pair-share activities and collaborative learning styles to increase engagement and cognition. With an effect size of 0.82 on Hattie's Visible Learning Model, it is a proven practice with all students, regardless of the targeted population. Scaffolded instruction is another well-established and research-based instructional practice with a 0.82 effect size in Hattie's analysis. This practice directly addresses all populations and our identified needs.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The Literacy Leadership Team meets with grade-level teams to analyze data to determine the target growth levels for specific students to meet the goals aforementioned. The instruction strategy will be altered to promote growth toward meeting the goals.	Castillo, Lissette, lissette.castillo@keysschools.com
The Literacy Coach will collaborate with PD liaison to provide professional development on the highest-yielding strategies which the Literacy Leadership team evaluated as being used less frequently used during walkthroughs. Additionally, the coach will assist in gleaning data quarterly, from various school assessment sources to support the Literacy Leadership team in taking steps toward goal attainment.	Castillo, Lissette, lissette.castillo@keysschools.com
Assessment data from ISIP, STAR and Progress Monitoring will be analyzed quarterly to identify students' growth trends. This data will be the talking point for discussions between Literacy leadership team and Literacy coach in determining what strategies need to be refined to meet proficiency target.	Fisher, Hannah, hannah.fisher@keysschools.com
Professional learning will be targeted by integrating AVID site team to support strategies aforementioned. PD Liaison will collaborate with district to provide professional development related to core program implementation by Literacy Leadership team and literacy coach based on the data from assessments aforementioned.	Ward, Debra, debra.ward@keysschools.com

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The foundations of our school culture at KLS are the relationships that we build with staff, students, parents, and stakeholders. Positive school culture and environment are created and maintained through positive communication and creating an environment of respect and rapport. Teachers establish a high degree of comfort with their students by building supportive classroom environments, encouraging innovation within the classroom, forming positive relationships, and engaging their students in purposeful interactions. The culture in the school for productive and respectful communication between teachers and staff is promoted through clearly defined roles, high expectations, and time for collaboration. We strive to establish school norms that build values while setting a consistent discipline that is equitable for all students. Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) is a school-wide system used to increase academic performance, increase safety, decrease problem behavior, and establish positive school cultures and environments. PBIS methods are research-based and proven to significantly reduce the occurrence of problem behaviors in the school, resulting in a more positive school climate and increased academic performance.

Additionally, KLS has implemented the following violence prevention programs to increase safety and promote positive school culture. Red Ribbon Week is an alcohol, tobacco, drug, and violence prevention week. Our school incorporates PBIS activities for KLS students and staff to pledge that they are drug-free, happy, and healthy. The Sandy Hook Promise- Start with Hello week raises awareness about social isolation and educates students on how to build empathy within the classroom and school environment. Say Something week (grades 6th-8th) takes a deeper look into teaching students how to recognize warning signs and threats of violence, and how to act immediately and say something to an adult. Purpose Prep, Studies Weekly, and Classroom Champions are programs rooted in our Healthy Living Initiative that aim to transform schools into supportive and successful learning environments.

Students who were at the highest risk level on the Panorama screener last school year will be pulled to join a group or meet with a counselor individually. The screener was used to determine if the student has a particular need or is considered high-risk. Counselors will meet or check in with students individually and if needed incorporate outside agencies. Students will be able to manage emotions and stress in the classroom by learning skills, techniques, and incorporating mental balance and stress release through elementary special areas and middle school electives (including their FLEX choices). By doing so, we will see positive changes in behavior patterns.

PBIS incentives for staff personal achievement and commitment to building a collaborative school culture include Bustin' Bass notes and gift cards, Staff Bustin' out early on Fridays, and bi-weekly teacher treats. PBIS incentives for students are POWER dollars, monthly activity days, Friday school spirit days, the elementary POWER dollar store, and the Middle School snack cart.

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

The stakeholders involved in building positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, Counselors and Social Worker (our School Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale-boosting activities. The Assistant Principals will monitor the mentorship programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders are responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families.

KLS strives to engage community stakeholders to connect community experts with our school. Staff participates in community events to connect the school and community. These events include team building such as our staff dodge ball tournament, Family Night Out, Conch Scramble, The Key Largo School Carnival, Key Largo Annual Witches Ride, Upper Keys Irish Festival, Community Band, AVID highway cleanups, Color Run, Halloween parade, Spooktacular, Career Day, Staff potluck, Hispanic Heritage Night, AVID Family STEAM night, etc.

Additionally, we have numerous agencies that provide wraparound services to support overall mental, physical and nutritional well-being. Some of these resources include Guidance Care Center, Wesley House, Kids Come First, Florida Keys Children's Shelter, DCF, Mobile Response Team, CINS/FINS, Feeding South

Florida, St. Mary's Star of the Sea Catholic Church, Farm Share, C.H.I.P.S., Kids In Special Situations, ChildFind, T.I.P.S. and numerous other local agencies.

Local agencies such as AHEC and Monroe County Health Department offer a coordinated level of school-based

health care that integrates education, medical, and/or social services at the school site. This partnership provides educational services such as Heiken Children's Vision Program, and Dental Sealants with AHEC. An AHEC grant allows KLS to have a physician's assistant on campus three days a week to provide care for children and staff. A full-time School Nurse Technician is on staff. Other community partnerships include Key Largo Rotary Club, Ocean Reef Community Foundation, Keys Children's Foundation, Island Dolphin Care, First State Bank, Centennial Bank, Dolphins Cove, Publix, United Way, and Take Stock in Children.