

Monroe County School District

Key West High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Key West High School

2100 FLAGLER AVE, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/723>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To empower all students to maximize their potential and prepare them with the skills and experiences necessary to be college or career ready and to develop those character traits that will enable them to be productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will be confident, self-motivated learners, foster a positive perspective both academically and socially, and will be mindful of a balanced mental and emotional health.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Palomino, Rebecca	Principal	To oversee curriculum and academic progress, personnel, daily management and operations of the school as well as fiscal management in a positive learning environment.
Perkins, Dave	Assistant Principal	To oversee curriculum and academic progress, personnel, daily management and operations of the school as well as fiscal management in a positive learning environment.
Ballard, Yanelys	Assistant Principal	To oversee curriculum and academic progress, personnel, daily management and operations of the school as well as fiscal management in a positive learning environment.
Veldheer, Ja-Ronika	Assistant Principal	To oversee curriculum and academic progress, personnel, daily management and operations of the school as well as fiscal management in a positive learning environment.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Building Level Planning Team (BLPT) is comprised of team leaders from each department within the school; the team meeting bi-weekly. The BLPT analyzed data and provided input in developing the SIP. The SIP goals will be presented to the School Advisory Council which meets monthly to gather input.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP monitoring will occur through Classroom Walkthroughs, Progress Monitoring Data Analysis, Building Level Planning Team Meeting Data Chats, Department Meeting Data Chats, Professional Learning Communities and Focus Groups.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	48	50	54	55	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				56			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			32		
Math Achievement*	54	53	38	46	41	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				55			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			14		
Science Achievement*	69	71	64	67	47	40	75		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	73	66	81	51	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					53	44			
Graduation Rate	90	92	89	92	64	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	56	58	65	54	78	67	50		
ELP Progress	35	39	45	49			38		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	90

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	658
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	48			
HSP	54			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	73			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	49			
HSP	55			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	56			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	44			54			69	72		90	56	35
SWD	23			29			45	35		22	6	
ELL	16			30			32	32		44	7	35
AMI												
ASN	64										1	
BLK	31			37			40	50		42	7	43
HSP	37			47			64	62		53	7	28
MUL	61			53			85	90			5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	53			67			79	84		60	6	
FRL	37			45			59	60		46	7	44

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	56	47	46	55	57	67	81		92	54	49
SWD	27	48	45	17	45	68	29	60		81	35	
ELL	32	51	47	25	49	53	47	52		85	33	49
AMI												
ASN	71	67		83	73		82					
BLK	30	45	43	20	45	57	46	78		94	38	44
HSP	49	52	44	40	48	55	59	73		88	51	50
MUL	73	65		47	53		73	85		85	45	
PAC												
WHT	62	63	54	61	64	60	77	87		95	61	
FRL	43	55	47	32	49	58	61	76		89	47	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	45	32	43	22	14	75	75		91	50	38
SWD	20	32	23	21	22	20	39	59		86	3	
ELL	21	37	33	23	18	10	42	31		72	38	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	44	47	23	17	12	52	58		92	7	30
HSP	49	37	25	38	19	13	71	77		85	54	40
MUL	65	45		55	23					100	30	
PAC												
WHT	69	53	32	56	28	21	87	77		96	66	
FRL	43	33	24	34	16	10	64	76		86	34	28

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	50%	-1%
09	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	48%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	50%	-13%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	63%	5%	48%	20%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	63%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	63%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Algebra I (37% raw data) showed the lowest performance. Factors contributing to the low performance include teacher attendance due to health issues.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

9th Grade FAST ELA showed the greatest decline from 51% (2022) to 36% (2023). Factors contributing to this decline include teacher turnover and student attendance.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest negative gap compared to the state is Algebra I. The factors contributing to this gap include teacher attendance due to health issues.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Geometry. KWHS scored 20 points higher than that of the state. These scores are attributed to the teacher adhering with fidelity to the new standards and curriculum.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The area with the most concern was attendance. 19.6% of all students were identified as missing more than 10% of school; 33% of seniors, 18% of juniors, 19% sophomores, & 10% of freshmen.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Attendance, ELA, & Algebra are our areas of highest priority.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of focus concerns ELA performance for 9th and 10th grade due to the decrease in proficiency scores from 51% level 3 and above in 2022 to 36% proficient level 3 and above in 2023 FAST. In addition, the ELA course failure rate increased from 2022 to 2023 in 9th and 10th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ELA scores for 9th grade and 10th grade will increase to 50% or better.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will include teacher-student data chats discussed at department meetings, bi-quarterly analysis of student performance reports for academic achievement, BLPT and department meeting minutes reflecting discussions on reading and writing best practices, and quarterly EWS analyses through FOCUS to determine trends in students at-risk.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicitly teach appropriate writing strategies across content areas using a Model-Practice-Reflect instructional cycle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The choice to increase the 9th and 10th grade ELA scores was based on the decrease in ELA FAST performance scores and the number of ELA course failures for 9th and 10th graders as evidenced by EWS data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Compilation of Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 data for BLPT presentations and teacher-student data chats and to determine implementation of intervention practices.

Person Responsible: June Walsh (june.pannela-walsh@keysschools.com)

By When: This will be done within one week of score release.

Ensuring/Monitoring ELA teacher use of district curriculum MyPerspectives (SAVVAS)

Person Responsible: David Erhard (david.erhard@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly Department Meetings & Admin Walkthroughs

Ensuring/Monitoring Reading teacher use of district curriculum iLit

Person Responsible: June Walsh (june.pannela-walsh@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly Department Meetings & Admin Walkthroughs

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student Attendance is an area of focus we hope to address to effectuate positive culture & environment. Data shows that 20% of students were identified as chronically absent during the 2022-2023 school year; 33% of seniors, 18% of juniors, 17% of sophomores and 10% of freshmen.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of students identified as chronically absent by 5% (20% in 2022-23).

Monitoring:

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

Attendance Committee Meetings, Counselor/Social Worker Behavioral Data Chats, Building Level Planning Team Meetings, Department Meetings, and FOCUS Group Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance Works recommends a tiered approach to promoting positive attendance and addressing chronic absenteeism: Foundational Supports to all students/families; universal prevention to all students/families (tier 1), early intervention (tier 2 of students missing 10-19%), and intensive intervention (tier 3 of students missing 20% or more).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research conducted by Attendance Works has established that foundational supports promote positive conditions for learning which leads to increased student engagement and regular attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Analyze EWS Attendance Data to identify students establishing a pattern of non-attendance, determine who may require tier 2 and tier 3 intervention, and align support.

Person Responsible: Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly

Implement Monthly & Quarterly Attendance Recognition for students meeting acceptable attendance parameters (<90% attendance).

Person Responsible: Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly & Quarterly