

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kingswood Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carmen Sheffield

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">74%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide all students with the skills necessary to be successful and productive members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kingswood will provide a personalized and equitable education for all students.

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
Sheffield, Carmen	Principal	Responsible for the full plant operations of the school and student achievement.
Ritchie, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Responsible for student achievement
Teeter, Kristina	Reading Coach	Assists with the responsibility of student achievement in ELA (coaching and planning with teachers, etc)
Andersen, Tawnya	Math Coach	Assists with responsibility of student achievement in Math (coaching and planning with teachers, etc)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Carmen Sheffield

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

1

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

445

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

3

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

2

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	62	51	70	81	67	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	10	2	13	19	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	17	20	20	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Wednesday 8/4/2021

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	42	65	61	73	63	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	380
Attendance below 90 percent	10	24	11	15	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	42	65	61	73	63	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	380
Attendance below 90 percent	10	24	11	15	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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				44%	52%	57%	50%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	50%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	54%	63%	64%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	57%	62%	63%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	46%	51%	44%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	50%	53%	51%	51%	55%

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	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Reading and Math, baseline and midyear science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	24	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	48
	Students With Disabilities	17		
	English Language Learners	18	18	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	21	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	20	42
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	9	9	18

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	48	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	46	68
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	40
	English Language Learners	14	43	57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	34	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	33	55
	Students With Disabilities		17	60
	English Language Learners	14	14	29
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	43	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	38	51
	Students With Disabilities	31	44	50
	English Language Learners	19	13	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	17	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	17	22
	Students With Disabilities	6	19	31
	English Language Learners		7	

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	32	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	44
	Students With Disabilities	31	37	44
	English Language Learners		13	11
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	17	22	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	22	40
	Students With Disabilities	31	25	44
	English Language Learners			22
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	9	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	29	42
	Students With Disabilities	33	31	31
	English Language Learners	18	9	27
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	27	27	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	34	38
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	23
	English Language Learners	27	27	36
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Science	All Students	41.50	41.88	
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	39.07	
	Students With Disabilities	32.40	30.89	
	English Language Learners	23.50	20.90	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

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	19	18		8			8				
ELL	35	50		32	21		36				
BLK	26	29		21	29		7				
HSP	46	48	40	39	31		38				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	59	50		51	36		38				
FRL	43	41	47	37	29	18	30				
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	6	40	56	29	40	42	8				
ELL	33	38	30	37	34		29				
BLK	39	64		66	64		17				
HSP	41	46	44	53	53	36	38				
WHT	52	60	45	67	67		50				
FRL	36	46	52	51	55	44	31				
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	15	25	15	33	43	30					
ELL	45	36		70	78						
BLK	46	45		63	64		42				
HSP	54	45	17	67	73	60	57				
MUL	42			50							
WHT	47	52	50	65	62	46	48				
FRL	47	47	39	61	65	48	48				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
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	40
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	22
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	44
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

2019 ELA Achievement for all subgroups is at or below 41% (except for White subgroup at 52%).
 Science Achievement for all subgroups is under 38% (except White subgroup at 50%).
 2021 - Math Learning Gains and BQ Learning Gains are at or below 32%. Science Achievement is at 31%.

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

Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains and Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains

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

Teachers will close monitor students' progress towards proficiency and gains in planning sessions, data meetings, and in daily instruction.

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

ELA Gains and Learning Gains

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

Small group instruction

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

Using data to determine possible misconceptions and scaffolding to plan for small groups.

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.

Professional development on intentional planning using data and learning ladders.

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

.Retention and recruitment of highly effective teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional Priority - Teachers will purposefully monitor student progress to significantly impact student learning.
 Rationale: Based on FSA data, we identified growth in proficiency in ELA, significant decreases in Math proficiency and inadequate progress with learning gains for Math. This can be attributed to lack of frequent progress monitoring of student data. Teachers and staff will spend more time planning quality lessons during common planning time and use tools to monitor and assess students' understanding of the standards during instruction.
 Based on 2021 data, proficiency levels for SWD were 11%, ELL students were 35% and Black students were 22%.
 Teachers will be closely monitor data of SWD, Black, ELL students

Measurable Outcome: Student FSA assessment data indicated growth in proficiency in ELA (44%-47%), but inadequate proficiency in Math and Science and learning gains in Math. Math 3+ was 41%, Science 3+ was 32%. Learning gains for Math were 32% and for Math BQ were 17%. 100% of students will demonstrate learning gains in ELA and Math and ELA and Math bottom quartile gains.
 SWD, Black and ELL students will make 100% learning gains on FSA 2022. 62% of SWD, Black and ELL student will reach proficiency across the content areas.

Monitoring: Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs using a monitoring tool to provide targeted and specific feedback based on instructional focus, task alignment, instructional priority and look-fors. A specific emphasis will be placed on monitoring of the under-performing subgroups; SWD, Black and ELL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teams will meet every Tuesday for aggressive monitoring of students' progress towards mastering standards and learning gains. Weekly planning will focus on teacher clarity around the standards and progress monitoring to check for students' understanding of the standards. Teachers will develop and use monitoring tools to ensure students are mastering the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learning gains data and ESSA subgroup data indicate significant deficiencies and lack of equity.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading and Math Coach will focus on weekly planning of high quality lessons during the teachers' common planning time. They will also focus on coaching and modeling instruction with teachers. Administration will meet weekly with coaches to determine next steps for teachers.

Person Responsible Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

Professional development will take place throughout the year during faculty meetings or after school. They will focus on aggressive monitoring of student progress and how to use the data to improve student performance.

Person Responsible Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 39% in 3rd grade and 49% in 5th grade scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to need for teacher clarity around the guiding questions and their relation to the learning targets. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include team planning around student task aligned to the focus standards/guiding questions.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of 3rd and 5th grade students scoring at level 3 on the monthly ELA assessment will increase to 62% as measured by the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs of ELA classrooms to provide targeted and specific based on our instructional priority and look fors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Questions and use it as a basis for backwards planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We will use collaborative planning with an emphasis on standards to strengthen teacher instructional practice in order to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards.

Person Responsible Kristina Teeter (kristina.teeter@hcps.net)

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning targets. An emphasis on this work will be on teacher understanding of the guiding question and connecting it for the students to the daily learning target.

Person Responsible Kristina Teeter (kristina.teeter@hcps.net)

Conduct focused walk throughs in grades 3-5, providing feedback to teachers on the learning target/task/guiding question alignment.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will form a PBIS team and update the school wide behavior plan. Our PBIS team and behavior committee will meet at least 1x per month to discuss how the behavior plan is being implemented and adjustments that need to be made.

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.

Our school mission is to provide a personalized and equitable education for all students. Our school's focus is high expectations for all students and staff and students having a growth mindset for learning. The top priority is equity in instructional practices and when making decisions for students.

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

Staff members of Kingswood, PTA, SAC, business partners and students pay key roles in promoting a positive environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00