

Monroe County School District

# Key Largo School



## 2018-19 School Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>16</b> |

## Key Largo School

104801 OVERSEAS HWY, Key Largo, FL 33037

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(As Reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>PK-8                       | Yes                    | 78%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 60%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | A       | B       | A*      |

### 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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                | Title                  |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Lietaert, Laura     | Principal              |
| Conley, Cheryl      | Assistant Principal    |
| Pais, Darren        | Assistant Principal    |
| Caputo, Katherine   | Teacher, K-12          |
| Simoga, Nancy       | Teacher, ESE           |
| Sullivan, Wendi     | Teacher, K-12          |
| Martinez, Christina | Administrative Support |
| Leffler, Mark       | Instructional Coach    |
| Kirkley, Margret    | Instructional Coach    |
| Crispino, Christine | Instructional Coach    |
| Steinmetz, Kelley   | Teacher, K-12          |
| Valdes, Veronika    | Teacher, K-12          |
| Ryan, Meghan        | Guidance Counselor     |
| Brown, Eva          | Teacher, K-12          |
| Zepeda, Tiffany     | Teacher, K-12          |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

Key Largo School has a shared leadership approach to decision making . A Building Level Planning Team (BLPT) is established with elected teachers representing K-2, 3-5, 6-8, Exceptional Student Education (ESE), and Support Staff. The BLPT 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.

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.

Laura Lietaert, Principal, along with Cheryl Conley and Darren Pais, Assistant Principals, share a common vision for the use of data-based decision making.

Margret Kirkley, Literacy Coach, and Christine Crispino, MTSS Coach, provide expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. They also identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum, behavior assessment, and intervention approaches.

Mark Leffler, Math Coach, and Margret Kirkley, Literacy Coach, develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards, programs, model best practices and co-teach model lessons.

Kelley Steinmetz, Intervention Teacher, Margret Kirkley, Literacy Coach, Christine Crispino, MTSS Coach identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students considered to be "at risk", and assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis.

Kathy Caputo represents grades K-2. Wendi Sullivan represents grades 3-5. Veronika Valdes represents grades 6-8. Nancy Simoga represents the ESE department. Christina Martinez represents the Support Staff. Meghan Ryan, Guidance Counselor, provides input and information regarding socioemotional learning, attendance, and restorative practices. Tiffany Zepeda and Eva Brown, AVID site coordinators, ensure that the team maintains a focus on the AVID certification instrument.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 18          | 14 | 17 | 16 | 10 | 12 | 7  | 8  | 9  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 5  | 13 | 6  | 1  | 2  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 22 | 14 | 17 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |

#### The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3  |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 44 |

**Date this data was collected**

Tuesday 11/13/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 17 | 15 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 7  | 6  | 8  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 84 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 2 | 0  | 0  | 11 | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 2  | 3  | 2 | 2  | 4  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 5  | 17 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 50 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |

**Year 2016-17 - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 17 | 15 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 7  | 6  | 8  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 84 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 2 | 0  | 0  | 11 | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 2  | 3  | 2 | 2  | 4  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 5  | 17 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 50 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Overall, the ELA data is the lowest, specifically the ELA learning gains and lowest 25% categories. This does not appear to be a trend, as the data for ELA has been up and down over the last three years.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Upon analysis of the data, grade three ELA data showed the largest drop from the previous year.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA learning gains showed the largest gap when compared to the state average.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The science data shows the most improvement. This data shows an upward trend over the past three years.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

These changes can be attributed to multiple factors: implementation of AVID strategies, data-driven lessons, data chats with teachers and students, and the use of Illuminate.

### School Data

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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 59%    | 64%      | 60%   | 64%    | 67%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 54%    | 58%      | 57%   | 62%    | 64%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52%    | 50%      | 52%   | 52%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 64%    | 66%      | 61%   | 67%    | 68%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    | 63%      | 58%   | 65%    | 67%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    | 50%      | 52%   | 57%    | 56%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 65%    | 70%      | 57%   | 56%    | 67%      | 53%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 85%    | 84%      | 77%   | 83%    | 85%      | 75%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |        |         |         |         |         | Total    |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4      | 5       | 6       | 7       | 8       |          |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 18 (0)                            | 14 (17) | 17 (15) | 16 (13) | 10 (8) | 12 (10) | 7 (7)   | 8 (6)   | 9 (8)   | 111 (84) |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (2)   | 0 (1)   | 0 (2)  | 1 (0)   | 2 (0)   | 0 (11)  | 4 (6)   | 7 (22)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 5 (2)   | 13 (3)  | 6 (2)  | 1 (2)   | 2 (4)   | 5 (3)   | 1 (0)   | 33 (16)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 3 (0)   | 22 (0) | 14 (5)  | 17 (17) | 23 (18) | 20 (10) | 99 (50)  |

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| <b>ELA</b>            |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2018        | 48%           | 62%             | -14%                              | 57%          | -9%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 65%           | 68%             | -3%                               | 58%          | 7%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -17%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2018        | 68%           | 66%             | 2%                                | 56%          | 12%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 65%           | 60%             | 5%                                | 56%          | 9%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 3%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 3%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2018        | 58%           | 58%             | 0%                                | 55%          | 3%                             |
|                       | 2017        | 63%           | 56%             | 7%                                | 53%          | 10%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -5%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -7%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                    | 2018        | 49%           | 56%             | -7%                               | 52%          | -3%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 55%           | 56%             | -1%                               | 52%          | 3%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -6%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -14%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                    | 2018        | 54%           | 56%             | -2%                               | 51%          | 3%                             |
|                       | 2017        | 62%           | 60%             | 2%                                | 52%          | 10%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -8%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -1%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                    | 2018        | 66%           | 64%             | 2%                                | 58%          | 8%                             |
|                       | 2017        | 61%           | 58%             | 3%                                | 55%          | 6%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 5%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 4%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2018        | 57%           | 63%             | -6%                               | 62%          | -5%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 72%           | 65%             | 7%                                | 62%          | 10%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -15%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2018        | 76%           | 64%             | 12%                               | 62%          | 14%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 80%           | 70%             | 10%                               | 64%          | 16%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -4%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 4%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2018        | 50%           | 60%             | -10%                              | 61%          | -11%                           |
|                       | 2017        | 64%           | 59%             | 5%                                | 57%          | 7%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -14%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -30%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                    | 2018        | 49%           | 55%             | -6%                               | 52%          | -3%                            |
|                       | 2017        | 44%           | 50%             | -6%                               | 51%          | -7%                            |



| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 67%    | 62%      | 5%                         | 54%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 70%    | 62%      | 8%                         | 53%   | 17%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 23%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 57%    | 59%      | -2%                        | 45%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 37%    | 53%      | -16%                       | 46%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 82%    | 74%      | 8%                    | 71%   | 11%                |
| 2017         | 79%    | 78%      | 1%                    | 69%   | 10%                |
| Compare      |        | 3%       |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 97%    | 76%      | 21%                   | 62%   | 35%                |
| 2017         | 95%    | 72%      | 23%                   | 60%   | 35%                |
| Compare      |        | 2%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         | 0%     | 56%      | -56%                  | 53%   | -53%               |

**Subgroup Data**

| 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 |
| WHT                                       | 67       | 54     | 54          | 72        | 63      | 65           | 72       | 91      | 55        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 52     | 50          | 45        | 54      | 38           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 54     | 53          | 61        | 56      | 55           | 66       | 81      | 60        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 28       | 46     | 48          | 37        | 57      | 56           | 45       | 60      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 52     | 53          | 60        | 56      | 54           | 59       | 81      | 58        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 50     | 52          | 50        | 50      | 59           |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| WHT                                       | 70       | 64     | 63          | 77        | 69      | 56           | 70       | 92      | 73        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 42     |             | 52        | 55      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 62     | 47          | 61        | 64      | 56           | 47       | 78      | 69        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 80       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 29       | 41     | 30          | 32        | 42      | 39           | 26       | 42      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 57       | 60     | 50          | 62        | 60      | 51           | 47       | 76      | 59        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 13       | 38     | 40          | 20        | 62      | 60           |          |         |           |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

**Activity #1**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>            | School Climate and Culture   |
| <b>Rationale</b>        | Although KLS has a fairly high average daily attendance rate, 95%, KLS had 68 chronically absent students and a 7.96% chronically absent rate in 2017 -2018. |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b> | Our goal for 2018-2019 is to reduce our chronically absent rate to 6% or less and our Total CA students to 48.   |
| <b>Point Person</b>     | Laura Lietaert (laura.lietaert@keysschools.com)  |

**Action Step**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Description</b>        | Assign students mentors and hold weekly mentor check-in with students<br>Recognize improved attendance<br>Utilize restorative practices over suspension<br>Conduct Attendance Team meetings with families of chronically absent students and connect them with community resources as needed.<br>PBIS changes<br>student selected AVID Gold Team clubs in middle school |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Meghan Ryan (meghan.ryan@keysschools.com)   |

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Description</b>        | Monitoring Early Warning System<br>Continuous communication with District Attendance Coordinator<br>Monitor mentor notes and follow up with specific needs<br>Attend family attendance meetings as needed |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Darren Pais (darren.pais@keysschools.com)   |

| Activity #2                   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Instruction  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | In an effort to improve instruction and student success, KLS will focus on the lowest performing areas.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | <p>ELA Achievement will increase 5 points to 64 percent.<br/>           ELA Learning Gains will increase 8 points to 62 percent.<br/>           ELA Lowest 25% will increase 5 points to 57 percent.</p> <p>Math Learning Gains will increase 8 points to 67 percent.<br/>           Math Lowest 25% will increase 5 points to 60 percent.</p> <p>Middle School Acceleration will increase 10 points to 69 percent.</p>  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Laura Lietaert (laura.lietaert@keysschools.com)  |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | <p>Develop a schoolwide system for marking text in ELA and math<br/>           Focus on increasing fluency in ELA and math in K-4<br/>           Teacher and student data chats<br/>           Consistent use of AVID WICOR strategies in schoolwide instruction<br/>           Assign mentors to identified students<br/>           Identify eligible students for middle school acceleration and provide opportunities through master schedule</p>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Margret Kirkley (margret.kirkley@keysschools.com)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | <p>Framework for instruction, lesson plans and classroom visits<br/>           Coaches working with grade levels and individuals to identify and support highest areas of need<br/>           Monitor student data sections in AVID binder<br/>           Conduct teacher data chats after each progress monitoring<br/>           Monitor weekly meeting notes and individual student data<br/>           Monitor middle school student progress and provide support to maintain a continued opportunity for acceleration</p> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Cheryl Conley (cheryl.conley@keysschools.com)  |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**  
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Key Largo School strives to engage community stakeholders as on-going partners in order to network and connect community experts with classroom teachers and students. Teams of staff participate in

community events to connect the school with the greater community. These events include: team building at Key Largo Chocolates, Community Paint Night, Key Largo Annual Witches Ride, Relay for Life, Irish Festival, Community Band, highway cleanup, and others.

Local agencies such as AHEC and the Monroe County Health Department offer a coordinated level of school-based health care that integrates education, medical, and/or social and human services at the school site. The partnership with AHEC provides educational services such as Showdown in Tothtown, Bone Zone, Walk through the Heart, and Scruba-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. Other key 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, and Take Stock in Children.

Annual Events Include:

Meet the Teacher  
AVID Parent Nights  
Title I Parent Night/Open House  
Student Success Night  
Families Building Better Readers  
Hispanic Heritage Food Truck Night  
Halloween Parade  
Spooktacular  
Book Fairs  
Dads Take your Child to School Day  
Patriots Day Ceremony  
Thanksgiving Feast  
Veterans Day Ceremony  
Santa's Workshop  
Holiday Breakfasts  
Canned Food Drives  
United Way Stuff the Bus  
Award Assemblies  
Fish Fry  
Color Run  
AVID STEAM Fair Night  
World Heritage Night  
Family Paint Night  
Concerts

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

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.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

Key Largo School has pre-school programs including Head Start, VPK and Pre-K ESE. Pre-school teachers work with kindergarten teachers to set expectations for kindergarten readiness. Pre-K teachers meet with kindergarten teachers and provide data to articulate the needs of children and assist in placement into kindergarten classes. The Galileo program and Unique Learning System (ULS) give data on readiness to start kindergarten. ESE Pre-K has a transition IEP meeting at the end of the year. At this point the academic plan is written as a collaborative effort. We invite parents, teachers and all other support teachers (speech, OT, PT) that should have a part in developing the new educational plan for success in kindergarten.

Spring Kindergarten Round-up is a parent orientation and welcome to our school. After parents complete the registration packet, the parent and student take part in a scavenger hunt in the kindergarten pod, have a snack in the cafeteria, and take a bus ride. Parents also hear from administration, Kindergarten teachers, the SRO, and the school nurse.

Outgoing eighth graders meet with Coral Shores counselors and administrators to learn about available programs in the high school. An evening parent/student orientation is provided at Coral Shores in the Spring of the eighth grade year. Near the end of the year, eighth graders travel to Coral Shores to participate in new student orientation and team building activities with students from other middle schools headed to Coral Shores. Eighth grade ESE students have a transitional IEP meeting with Coral Shores and Key Largo School staff.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

Title I, Part A

Key Largo School will provide resources to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school programs, or summer school). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring that supplemental staff development needs are provided. Supplemental support services are also provided to students. The district English Learners (EL) Specialist for Title I schools works with EL contacts to provide supplemental professional development and instructional resources as well as help identify student needs through assessment and other instructional data. The school works with the district Parent Engagement Coordinator to reduce the impact of barriers to family engagement. Tutorials include Math, Reading and Science in the morning and afternoon hours. CHIPS Homeless contacts are funded through Title I to assure that students in transitional homes remain on the pathway for college and career readiness and work with the district homeless liaison to assure students receive Title I services including instructional supplies, nutritional services, transportation and tutoring.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education for the students at Key Largo School as follows:

- \* Partial Funding of the Literacy Coach
- \* Professional development for teachers and staff of diverse learners

- \* ESOL Endorsement coursework offered through the district leading to ESOL endorsement
- \* Reimbursement for add-on endorsement programs, such as Gifted, and reading bonuses, as funding permits

#### Title III

Key Largo School also provides professional development funded in part by Title III on EL strategies for teachers of all contents and cultural proficiency.

#### Title X- Homeless

The board policy defines the McKinney-Vento Law and ensures homeless students receive all the services to which they are entitled. Key Largo School seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with Local Agencies and with parents and the community. Our Guidance Counselors serve as our Homeless Liaison and assists with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. The Homeless Liaison works closely with our school registrar on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and on the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized, separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements. Key Largo School provides a homeless sensitivity awareness training for all staff members. Our CHIPS contact works with teachers and the district homeless contact to make sure that homeless students engage in tutoring as needed.

#### Violence Prevention Programs

Red Ribbon Week and the Second Step Program support the prevention of violence in and around Key Largo School. These programs prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco, drugs and foster a safe, drug-free learning environment supporting student achievement. In addition, we have implemented a bullying prevention curriculum. This curriculum provides students with an understanding and awareness of the severity and consequences of bullying. Bullying awareness is supported throughout the month of October with different activities and awareness messages.

#### Nutrition Programs

- 1) Key Largo School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
- 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
- 3) Key Largo School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after school snack follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

#### Parental Involvement

Key Largo School involves parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extends an open invitation to the school's parent resource area in order to inform parents about available programs and their rights under ESSA and other referral services. We aim to increase parent engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parent input) Key Largo School Title I compact: Key Largo School Title I Parent Involvement Plan; scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting; and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements. Informal parent surveys are conducted to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academic Nights, etc. with flexible times to accommodate our parents. This impacts our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

AHEC and the Florida Department of Health - Monroe County offer coordinated levels of school-based healthcare to the students at Key Largo School and their families which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds. AHEC services reduce barriers to care, connect eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provide care for students who are not eligible for other services.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

NA

| Part V: Budget |        |
|----------------|--------|
| Total:         | \$0.00 |