# Key Largo School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Key Largo School

## 104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

## https://www.keysschools.com/domain/573

**Demographics**

## Principal: Darren Pais E

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>PK-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 67% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (58%)<br><br>2017-18: B (61%)<br><br>2016-17: A (64%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **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 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

# 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) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 60% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

## 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 Monroe County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Preparing All Students for Success in a Global Society

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

## School Leadership Team

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

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Barry, Michele | Teacher, ESE | |
| Leffler, Mark | Math Coach | |
| Castillo, Lissette | Reading Coach | |
| Zepeda, Tiffany | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Brown, Eva | Teacher, K-12 | |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 8/23/2021, Darren Pais E

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

4

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

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

63

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

775

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

14

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

14

**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 | 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 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/23/2021

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## 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 | | | | 62% | 64% | 61% | 59% | 64% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60% | 61% | 59% | 54% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 51% | 54% | 52% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 63% | 66% | 62% | 64% | 66% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 64% | 59% | 59% | 63% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 51% | 52% | 55% | 50% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 56% | 67% | 56% | 65% | 70% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 81% | 85% | 78% | 85% | 84% | 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 | 59% | 70% | -11% | 58% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 58% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 62% | 0% | 56% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 57% | -3% | 54% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 58% | -1% | 52% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 56% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 62% | -2% | 62% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 64% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 66% | -22% | 60% | -16% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 55% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 61% | 4% | 54% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 61% | 1% | 46% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 65% | -5% | 53% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 56% | -6% | 48% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 81% | 80% | 1% | 71% | 10% |
| 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 | 93% | 70% | 23% | 61% | 32% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 69% | -69% | 57% | -57% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten Star Early Literacy
1-8 Star Reading and Math
Illuminate Science Grade 5 and 8
Illuminate Civics Grade 7

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38 | 49 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 46 | 58 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29 | 43 | 51 |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 23 | 45 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 61 | 72 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 59 | 70 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 35 | 55 | 64 |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 49 | 54 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 36.4 | 40.2 | 48.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26.7 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26.7 | 37.5 | 43 |
| | English Language Learners | 5 | 12 | 19 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 37 | 46 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 46 | 53 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18 | 33 | 44 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 16 | 36 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48 | 55 | 58 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 49 | 55 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 28 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 36 | 39 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 62 | 60 | 65 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 46 | 53 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 38 | 32 | 44 |
| | English Language Learners | 36 | 41 | 48 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43 | 41 | 44 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 35 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 23 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 45 | 19 | 30 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 47 | 48 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 39 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 28 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 45 | 31 | 50 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43 | 41 | 44 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 35 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 23 | 31 |
| | English Language Learners | 45 | 19 | 30 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 47 | 48 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 39 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 28 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 45 | 31 | 50 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 17 | 30` | 45 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 27 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 40 | 41 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 12 | 15 |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42 | 37 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 34 | 36 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 24 | 31 |
| | English Language Learners | 39 | 25 | 38 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 41 | 46 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 41 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 34 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 37 | 35 | 31 |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47. | 43 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 38 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 36 | 20 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 24 | 32 | 37 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49 | 48 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 45 | 44 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37 | 36 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 19 | 18 |
| **Civics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14 | 39 | 82 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 21 | 64 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 23 | 64 |
| | English Language Learners | 14 | 29 | 34 |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47 | 42 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 38 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 36 | 21 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 28 | 37 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46 | 47 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 42 | 44 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37 | 19 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 40 | 45 | 51 |
| **Science** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20 | 0 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18 | 0 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 0 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 18 | 0 | 15 |

## 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 | 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 | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 69 | 65 | 71 | 72 | 66 | 42 | 66 | 86 | 47 | | |
| FRL | 56 | 58 | 51 | 58 | 56 | 39 | 47 | 77 | 43 | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 28 | 46 | 48 | 37 | 57 | 56 | 45 | 60 | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 50 | 52 | 50 | 50 | 59 | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 52 | 50 | 45 | 54 | 38 | 8 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 54 | 53 | 61 | 56 | 55 | 66 | 81 | 60 | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 54 | 54 | 72 | 63 | 65 | 72 | 91 | 55 | | |
| FRL | 54 | 52 | 53 | 60 | 56 | 54 | 59 | 81 | 58 | | |

## 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 525 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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?

The school to district comparison shows an increase in the Achievement gap widening from 4th-6th grade in math. The Black/African American Subgroups overall decreased in math across all grade levels.
There was an increase in 8th Grade ELA performed 8% above the district; 6th Grade Math performed 6% above the district; 3rd Grade Math performed 3% above the district; 8th Grade Science performed 7% above the district.

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

Current 6th Grade students and Black/African American sub-group for math are performing below state and district averages.

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

In previous years, we have been focused on implementing standards-based instruction in all classrooms. We will continue to support this while incorporating data-driven instruction to help meet the needs of the at-risk student subgroup (MTSS). We will also develop 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 in our data chats.

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

8th Grade ELA
6th Grade Math
3rd Grade Math
8th Grade Science

### 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.
BEST ELA training for K-2

New actions
Teacher modeling of lessons and instruction
MFAS training for 5th-grade math
WICOR training for new 8th grade ELA
BEST Math training for 3-5

### 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.**

WICOR AVID training for new staff members
WICOR AVID continuous training for all staff
AVID Summer Institute
MFAS system
Support Facilitation/ Co-Teaching Professional Learning
Phonics First/Orton Gillingham training from BrainSpring

**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 schedules
Professional development for teachers on math and reading interventions, AVID strategies, and MFAS are supported by the school, district, and State, as these are research-based.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | According to FSA performance data, only 27% of the current 6th-grade students were proficient in math. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 80% of the 6th-grade student population will be either proficient or show learning gains of 1 year or more according to STAR or FSA. |
| **Monitoring:** | STAR, MFAS, Freckle, Kahn Academy, and other formative assessments will be used to monitor student progress.<br>Information from Data chats, walk-throughs, teacher coaching, team planning, teacher modeling of instruction and lesson planning will be used to support growth. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Hannah Fisher (hannah.fisher@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Targeted interventions through school-wide use of AVID Strategies and MFAS system, small group collaboration, differentiated instruction.<br>Identified students will be provided opportunities for intervention through Title I after-school tutoring, morning Jump Start tutoring, and Math Intervention classes. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The use of evidence-based strategies (AVID, MAFS, small group collaboration, data chats, and Differentiated Instruction) 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.<br><br>The MFAS system includes tasks and problems that teachers can implement with their students, and rubrics that help the teacher interpret students' responses. Students are asked to perform mathematical tasks, explain their reasoning, and justify their solutions. Teachers then use rubrics for interpreting and evaluating student responses in order to differentiate instruction based on students' strategies. By understanding student thinking, instruction can be modified to improve student achievement of mathematical goals related to the standards. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that fall into this subgroup.
2. Prioritize students within this subgroup to be invited to Jumpstart and Title I tutoring thus expanding the school day for targeted students and expand Title I tutoring and E/I Program to be more inclusive of mathematics.
3. Modify roles and schedules of Interventionists.
4. District Support from Mathematics Curriculum Specialist
5. Increase Culturally Relevant Awareness and Teaching Strategies

.

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | DESSA was administered to the elementary students twice in the 20-21 school year, while the COVI was taken twice by the upper-grade students. Both screeners were used to determine if students have particular needs or are considered high risk.<br>Based on the results, DESSA & COVI identified Student Zest as the attribute that falls into the high-risk category for Key Largo School. This refers to the desire for intellectual stimulation and engagement. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | With consistent student incentives, after the second 2021-22 SEL screener our Student Zest risk level will no longer be identified as the highest area of risk. |
| **Monitoring:** | Panorama will be used in the 21-22 school year to review the SEL data and address social-emotional needs. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Blanche (nicole.blanche@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | In an effort to successfully address the targeted element of Student Zest, our school will engage in activities aligned with PBIS that will contribute to improved student perceptions. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Interest and obstacle inventory will be given to students and staff.
2. Restructure activities and incentives based on student and staff inventory results.
3. Continue with PBIS monthly meetings to plan and disseminate information to grade-level teams.

**Person Responsible**    Carrie Kerns (carrie.kerns@keysschools.com)

| #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on ESSA data and district-wide data collection, our black/African-American subgroup was at 40% proficiency in the areas of reading and mathematics. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 45% of our Black/African-American subgroup will be either proficient or show learning gains of 1 year or more according to STAR or FSA In both areas of reading and mathematics. |
| **Monitoring:** | STAR, MFAS, Freckle, Kahn Academy, and other formative assessments will be used to monitor student progress. Information from Data chats, walk-throughs, teacher coaching, team planning, teacher modeling of instruction and lesson planning will be used to support growth. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Debra Ward (debra.ward@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The use of evidence-based strategies (AVID, MAFS, small group collaboration, data chats, and Differentiated Instruction) 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:** | The MFAS system includes tasks and problems that teachers can implement with their students, and rubrics that help the teacher interpret students' responses. Students are asked to perform mathematical tasks, explain their reasoning, and justify their solutions. Teachers then use rubrics for interpreting and evaluating student responses in order to differentiate instruction based on students' strategies. By understanding student thinking, instruction can be modified to improve student achievement of mathematical goals related to the standards. 4

Implementation of the B.E.S.T Standards with collaborative supports through AVID for small group and differentiated instruction provides opportunities for students to received individualized instruction to meet specific needs. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Identify students that fall into this subgroup with focus on specific needs for improvement based on domain and subscores on prior year state assessment.

| **Person Responsible** | Debra Ward (debra.ward@keysschools.com) |
|---|---|

Prioritize students within this subgroup to be invited to Jumpstart and Title I tutoring thus expanding the school day for targeted students and expand Title I tutoring and E/I Program to be more inclusive of mathematics.

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

Modify roles and schedules of Interventionists.

| **Person Responsible** | Darren Pais (darren.pais@keysschools.com) |
|---|---|

District Support from curriculum specialists including modeling, lesson plan analysis, and professional learning opportunities for teachers focused on the subgroup.

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

Increase Culturally Relevant Awareness and Teaching Strategies through professional learning opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Darren Pais (darren.pais@keysschools.com)

| #4. Other specifically relating to RAISE Program ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | According to the FSA data in 2020-2021, English Language Arts in grades 4 and 5 are identified to be a critical need for improvement. 48% of 4th graders in 2020-2021 exhibited proficiency in the ELA FSA, and 42% of 5th graders in 2020-2021 exhibited proficiency in the ELA FSA. Contributing factors include ELL and ESE proficiency as well as interrupted learning situations. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Based on the results of the 2022 ELA FSA, overall proficiency in grades 4 and 5 in the area of English Language arts will increase from 48/42% to greater than 55% proficiency in each grade level. |
| **Monitoring:** | Monitoring will be provided through STAR progress monitoring as well as through ISIP progress monitoring in Istation. Tiered support will be in place to monitor and modify instruction based on need. Monthly updates of progress will be shared with leadership for discussion and modification as needed. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lissette Castillo (lissette.castillo@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Implementation of a strong MTSS framework to support core instruction and differentiated instruction for students based on individual needs. Frequent data chats to plan for instruction, complete core instruction and MTSS interventions as appropriate from the data, study the results, and make changes as needed will be implemented (plan, do, study, act). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Implementation and monitoring of a rigorous core instructional curriculum using the Florida Standards. In addition, consistent monitoring and differentiated interventions will be in place based on the MTSS framework. Students will collaborate using both physical and digital tools using various AVID strategies. Instructional support and small groups will be established supported by the administration to monitor growth and progression. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Strong core instructional strategies and instructional materials are in use with fidelity in the classroom following the Florida Standards and AVID system.

| **Person Responsible** | Darren Pais (darren.pais@keysschools.com) |
|---|---|

Consistent review of data as provided through progress monitoring and ISIP data monthly to be shared with administration and grade level teams to make adaptations to lesson planning and differentiated instruction.

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

Alignment of various measures of achievement will be kept in a data log for each student who does not show proficiency to highlight and target areas for growth.

| **Person Responsible** | Debra Ward (debra.ward@keysschools.com) |
|---|---|

Continued professional learning opportunities available for staff in the areas of AVID, core instructional content, and instructional materials provided.

| **Person Responsible** | Tiffany Zepeda (tiffany.zepeda@keysschools.com) |
|---|---|

### 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.

**Based on the data from the Safe Schools for Alex, our school will focus on reducing the number of violent incidents, specifically fighting. We selected violent incidents as our area of focus due to the high number of cases reported including fighting, threat or intimidation, and sex offense.**

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

## 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 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, how to act immediately and say something to an adult. Purpose Prep and Second Step are programs rooted in social-emotional learning that aim to transform schools into supportive and successful learning environments.

Students who were at the highest risk level on the DESSA and Covitatlity screeners last school year will be pulled to join a group or meet with a counselor individually. Both screeners were 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 art. By doing so, we will see positive changes in behavior patterns. WhyTry curriculum and A Little Spot of Life Skills will also be used to teach common life skills such as optimism, zest, courage, confidence, teamwork, perseverance, and how to manage emotions.

PBIS incentives for staff personal achievement and good behavior include Bustin' Bass notes and gift cards, Staff Bustin' out early on Fridays, bi-weekly teacher treats, kindness emails, Teacher appreciation week and grams, and improvements around campus such as the faculty lounge and production staff room. PBIS incentives for students are POWERdollars, monthly activity days, the elementary POWERdollar Store, and the Middle School snack cart.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, and Counselors (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 at Key Largo Chocolates, Key Largo Annual Witches Ride, Relay for Life, Irish Festival, Community Band, highway cleanup, McTeacher 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, 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 Showdown in Toothtown, Bone Zone, Walk through the Heart, Heiken Children's Vision Program, Dental Sealants with AHEC, and Scrubba-Bubba. An AHEC grant allows KLS to have a physician's assistant on campus three days a week to provide care for children and staff. Additionally, a full-time School Nurse Technician was added to the staff this year. Other community partnerships include Key Largo Rotary Club, Ocean Reef Community Foundation, Keys Children's

Foundation, Island Dolphin Care, First State Bank, Center State Bank, Centennial Bank, Dolphins Cove, Publix, United Way, and Take Stock in Children.