King High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Basham

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

King High School will support all students' growth as critical thinkers, global citizens and informed decision makers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a community which demonstrates the principles of P.R.I.D.E. (Positivity, Respect, Integrity, Determination and Excellence)

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Castelli, Arlene	Principal	Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with individuals both within and outside of school
Dent, Autumn	Other	Tier 1 Behavior Support Student Interventions
Cary-Greco, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	CTA Building Rep, Social Studies Teacher
Walters, Quicta	Teacher, K-12	
Barnes, Meghan	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Stone-Geide, Bianca	Other	Attendance, RTI
Briette, Djenane	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, member of ILT
Moody, Richard	Other	Tier 1 behavior support, leads MTSS monitoring and implementation

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Basham

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

96

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,418

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

23

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	345	365	349	1418
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	93	0	0	193
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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 8/17/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	395	349	406	1490
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	134	122	139	513
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	54	25	19	156
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	0	0	0	0	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	47	82	47	38	214

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	395	349	406	1490
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	134	122	139	513
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	54	25	19	156
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	0	0	0	0	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	47	82	47	38	214

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	52%	51%				48%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						55%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						36%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	34%	39%	38%				28%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	37%						33%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						43%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	57%	46%	40%				55%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	49%	48%				74%	75%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	66%	-14%	67%	-15%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	73%	0%	70%	3%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	12%	63%	-51%	61%	-49%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	34%	57%	-23%	57%	-23%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	37	32	27	44	39	22	35		85	8
ELL	17	46	36	20	30		52	24		75	39
ASN	94	87		95			88	94		99	96
BLK	21	46	38	18	32	44	27	37		89	23
HSP	35	52	39	43	48		61	61		78	42
MUL	69	68		43			64	60		95	61
WHT	53	56	43	43	39		81	55		96	65
FRL	25	44	37	25	39	41	38	37		86	30

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	26	42	38	18	32	34	20	33		83	11
ELL	16	32	26	14	23	22	39	33		79	39
ASN	89	71		76	43		91	100		99	96
BLK	26	34	33	14	18	29	28	38		82	15
HSP	43	44	32	26	19	24	57	53		86	52
MUL	61	55		21	30		64	73		84	75
WHT	48	46	25	35	18		57	78		83	70
FRL	28	35	31	16	19	27	35	44		81	29

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	14	35	33	16	24	31	26	49		77	6
ELL	16	47	42	17	41	50	28	46		60	27
ASN	92	86		78	60		96	92		98	92
BLK	23	40	35	14	27	37	26	54		79	17
HSP	38	50	45	21	31	70	55	71		75	52
MUL	63	63		40	23		72	94		100	56
WHT	62	57	35	47	47		71	97		92	71
FRL	28	44	37	19	31	45	35	62		79	26

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	90%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

Students performed lower than the district average in several areas. While our students increased in Biology proficiency, other areas where literacy would impact a student's ability saw decreasing proficiency. In US History, proficiency decreased by 9 points. In Literacy, students 9th grade proficiency decreased by 3 points and 10th grade proficiency decreased by 7 points.
We did see some growth in math proficiency scores, which were the result of focused collaboration in PLC and lesson development.

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

We need to increase proficiency and bottom quartile learning gains in literacy. Increasing student proficiency here will also impact other EOC and state tests which require literacy skills to demonstrate content knowledge (US History, Biology).

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

In literacy, attention was paid to content rather than acquisition of skills. There was a disconnect in curriculum between the English classes and the Reading classes, so students were not being given supports but rather competing stories.
By working laterally with all literacy teachers by grade level, teachers can collaborate on common needs for students.

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

Math proficiency saw an increase in multiple areas. In Algebra, there was a seven percent increase overall. In Geometry, there was a 12 percent increase in proficiency.
We also saw a seven percent increase in Biology proficiency.

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

All of these increases are attributable to an increased focus on collaboration between teachers for lesson planning and through PLC's for data analysis.
Specifically in Algebra and Geometry, teachers collaboratively planned lessons based on common misconceptions found during student assessment.
In Biology, teachers also planned the use of PENDA as a targeted instruction piece which addressed specific deficits in student understanding,

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

We will continue to implement a structure in our PLC's which allows teachers to collaborate and share best practices. We will focus this year on ways to increase student collaboration in classes.

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.

We will be implementing Learning Walks through demonstration classrooms. In the classes where we saw gains and increased student collaboration, teachers will observe a master teacher and the ways they build collaboration with their students.
We will also provide direct Professional Development via the academic coaches.

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

By developing the use of demonstration classrooms at King, we can ensure the stability of the professional learning. Using teachers as experts within the demonstration classroom builds the capacity of not only the observing teachers, but also the master teacher.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The areas we saw the greatest growth in were also the areas where we implemented and supported collaborative planning in last year's work. Collaborative planning allows teachers to share the best instructional practices for a given activity or standard. By collaborating, teachers can ensure they are providing a consistent and engaging lesson across the department and PLC.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase proficiency in all areas across contents. In US History, our goal is to move from 55% to 60%; Biology from 56% to 60%; Algebra from 16% to 25%; Geometry from 43% to 45%; 9th ELA from 40% to 45%; and 10th ELA from 38% to 45%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	With the introduction of the Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 seasons prior to EOC and BEST Assessments, we will use the data from them to target student progress. After each PM, teachers will be guided through the data and plan lessons based on the assessment data, highlighting areas of growth for their specific students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Meghan Barnes (meghan.barnes@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning in all EOC courses will allow our teachers to provide consistently rigorous instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers who work in isolation are rarely successful; in each content area, the ones who collaborated on students strengths and needs were the ones which saw increases in tested scores. By creating some procedures and structures to this plan, all teachers and students will be able to benefit from collaborative planning.

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.

Create structure and time for collaborative planning sessions per EOC course

Person Responsible	Meghan Barnes (meghan.barnes@hcps.net)

Monitor collaborative planning sessions for evidence of implementation

Person Responsible	Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

Conduct coaching sessions based on collaborative planning and feedback

Person Responsible	Meghan Barnes (meghan.barnes@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Attendance data for KHS impacts the amount of time students are actively engaged in learning. In the past year, we did not reach the threshold for testing required by the state. We also noticed trends in students, specifically SWD, missing instructional time due to ISS. This can lead to a disconnect once back in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We aim to increase our overall daily attendance to 95% and decrease our incidences of skipping and tardies to class.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will utilize an MTSS type process for monitoring attendance patterns.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bianca Stone-Geide (bianca.stone-geide@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PBIS is being implemented to reward students who are attending classes regularly and to motivate students to attend classes regularly. ISS is also being reworked to include daily instruction from core area teachers to ensure that students do not fall behind academically.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The CCEISS team and lead Richard Moody are analyzing the data for our students. In 2020-2021, our SWD Risk Ratio for OSS was a 3.4. Last year, we have worked to close that gap to a 1.55.

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.

Coordinating and rostering students who need ISS with instruction during the day.

Person Responsible	Richard Moody (richard.moody@hcps.net)

Provide behavioral interventions in core classes, eliminating the need for student removal.

Person Responsible	Autumn Dent (autumn.dent@hcps.net)

Coordinate with the Future Career Academy to increase student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Person Responsible	Autumn Dent (autumn.dent@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students coded as English Language Learners have performed below the state, district, and school on ELA FSA EOC course. This also impacts the students' ability to perform in other text-heavy EOC courses like Biology and US History.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal would be to increase the ELL students performance on multiple assessments (WIDA, FSA, etc) to show gains in language acquisition.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The ELL specialist will work in coaching cycles with teachers and offer push-in support to LYA and LYB students in core classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Meghan Barnes (meghan.barnes@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Coaching cycles will allow for the biggest impact in our core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Coaching cycles will allow the students to benefit from masterful instruction and for teachers to co-plan and teach with language acquisition as a goal.

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.

Coaching cycles in conjunction with ELL Specialist and Literacy Coach

Person Responsible	Djenane Briette (djenane.briette@hcps.net)

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

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

N/A

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

KHS utilizes several positive incentive systems to encourage a positive school culture. First, we emphasize PRIDE (Positivity, Respect, Integrity, Determination, and Excellence) in all interaction at school. Our Tier 1 behavior plan outlines what the elements of PRIDE look like in each part of the school. Also, we provide positive incentives via drawings from tickets that students can receive for engaging in excellence in attendance and respectfulness.

For teachers, we also provide positive incentives for their demonstrations of PRIDE by using the same system of ticketing and incentives as the students.

Finally, for all school-based stakeholders, we build a connection to the community within the school. New students are recruited into sports and clubs; new teachers are paired up with a site mentor. The PTSA is an active organization which also recognizes KHS teachers routinely for their work.

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

Students - We encourage students to display PRIDE in all they do, whether in the classroom or in the greater school environment.

Teachers/Staff - We encourage positive interactions between all stakeholders prior to any needed support for consequences.

We utilize three full-release adults (teachers and assistant teachers) to work with students in the hallways. These adults provide the support for administration by interacting with students in a positive manner and encouraging positivity in students.

Administrative Team - Implement restorative practices in lieu of classroom removal and suspension

Community - We encourage alumni to be involved in supporting current students through activities and funding of incentives.