Kingswood Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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
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
Sheffield, Carmen	Principal	Responsible for the full plant operations of the school and student achievement.
Ritchie, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Responsible for student achievement
Andersen, Tawnya	Math Coach	Assists with responsibility of student achievement in Math (coaching and collaboration with teachers, pulling student groups)
Schafer, Sarah	Reading Coach	Assists with the responsibility of student achievement in ELA (coaching and collaboration with teachers, pulling student groups)
Hough, Shelby	Science Coach	Assists with responsibility of student achievement in Science (coaching and collaboration with teachers, pulling student groups)
Rios, Patricia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Assists with responsibility of student achievement for ELL students (coaching and collaboration with teachers, compliance of ELL program)
Kenny, Dianna	SAC Member	Chair of the School Advisory Council

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Carmen Sheffield

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

458

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

13

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

11

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	65	77	59	81	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	0	26	21	24	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	33	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	1	3	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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%	53%	56%				44%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						53%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	50%	50%				59%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						58%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	59%	59%				37%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

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	21	42	42	24	58	62	17				
ELL	20	43	50	42	85	82	20				
BLK	23	56		34	83	80	18				
HSP	39	54	57	47	79	78	31				
WHT	57	63		66	62		35				
FRL	40	57	61	47	74	72	29				

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				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

2021- Math Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile Learning Gains were at or below 32%. Science achievement was at 31%. ELA Achievement, Learning Gains and BQ Learning Gains were below 50% (47%)
2022 - Math Achievement improved to 51%, while Math LG and BQ Learning Gains rose to over 70%. Science achievement stayed the same (31%). While ELA Learning Gains and BQ Learning Gains rose to 57% and 59% respectively, ELA Achievement fell to 42%.

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

ELA Achievement and Science Achievement

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

Factors contributing to need for ELA improvement were . .. . Factors that contributed to Science Achievement were . . .
To address the need for improvement, teachers and staff members will increase their knowledge of the new BEST benchmarks and aggressively monitor students' progress towards proficiency on state assessments. Science . . .

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

Math Achievement rose by 10 percentage points (41%-51%). Math Learning Gains rose from 32% to 75%. Math BQ Learning Gains rose from 17% to 73%.

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

Teachers and students purposefully monitored data and made instructional decisions based on that data. Teachers strategically planned questions, anticipated student responses and pulled small groups based on student needs. Teachers provided in the moment feedback to students. Resource personnel (VE, AGP and instructional coaches) were very strategic about the groups they pulled.

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

We will need to continue with the actions we took last year, while aggressively monitoring data and providing timely feedback to students.

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 aggressive monitoring, targeted feedback to students, BEST benchmarks and curriculum resources.

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

Continued retention and recruitment of highly effective teachers.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Instructional Priority - Teachers will aggressively monitor student progress, provide feedback and implement decisions that significantly impact student learning. Rationale: Based on FSA data, we made great gains in Math and Reading, however still need to improve growth in proficiency. Based on 2022 ELA FSA scores, our SWD, ELL and Black subgroups made significant progress in Learning gains from the previous year (SWD 18%D, ELL and Black subgroups made significant progress in Learning gains from the previous year (SWD 18% -42% LG, Black 29% - 56% LG, ELL - 50% BQ LG), however our proficiency levels for the subgroups were 21% for SWD, 21% for ELL and 23% for Black students. We will increase instructional improvements by focusing on increased proficiency for these subgroups through aggressive monitoring of data (by students, teachers and staff) and by providing immediate feedback to students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student FSA data indicated high gains in Math achievement (41% to 51%) and great Learning gains for Math (LG: 32% to75% and BQ LG: 17% to 73%). ELA Learning Gains grew from 47% to 57% and BQ LG grew from 47% to 59%. ELA achievement fell from 47% in 2021 to 42% in 2022. Our school goal is for SWD, Black and ELL students to grow to 50% proficiency in ELA and to increase to 60% proficiency overall.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Students will hold themselves accountable by monitoring their progress towards their personalized goals. Teachers will assist students in creating goals, aggressively monitor their progress, provide immediate feedback and implement instructional decisions to increase growth. Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs and provide targeted, specific feedback based on instructional focus, instructional priority and look-fors. A specific emphasis will be placed on monitoring students in the SWD, Black and ELL subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teams will meet every Tuesday in PLCs for aggressive monitoring of students' progress towards these goals. Professional development will be planned based on understanding the B.E.S.T benchmarks, vocabulary and language acquisition for ELA and ELL students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Proficiency in ELA and for ESSA subgroup data for SWD, ELL and Black students indicate deficiencies and lack of equity.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Reading, Math, Science and ELL coaches will focus on weekly collaboration with teachers to unpack the BEST benchmarks and create high quality lessons. They will focus on coaching and modeling instruction with teachers. Administration will meet with coaches weekly to determine next steps for teachers.

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

Professional development will take place throughout the year during faculty meeting or on Mondays. They will focus on teacher clarity of the BEST benchmarks and aggressive monitoring of student progress and how to use data to improve student performance.

Person Responsible   Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@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

For 2021-2022, our Kindergarten, First and Second grades had 73%, 44% and 49% of students reading at or above grade level, respectively. Indicating that 0% of our Kindergarten students, 59% of our First Grade students, and 49% of our Second Grade Students were reading one to two grade levels below grade level. For the 2022-2023 school year, the instructional practices specifically relating to Reading and ELA that will positively impact student achievement are grade level specific targeted foundational skills lessons based on the BEST Benchmarks. Planning and professional development will center around instructional practices that are explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory to create ideal environments for learning Foundations skills. Consistent routines as a delivery model for learning in this area will create automatic reading and writing habits beneficial for the execution of decoding and encoding with accuracy. In tandem, intentional placement of vocabulary and language acquisition will be applied to opportunities within Foundations Skills learning.

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

For 2021-2022, our Third, Fourth, and Fifth grades had 36%, 40% and 39% of students reading at or above grade level, respectively. For the 2022-2023 school year, the instructional practices specifically relating to Reading and ELA that will positively impact student achievement are grade level specific targeted foundational skills lessons based on the BEST Benchmarks. Specific to intermediate this will encompass both grade level benchmarks necessary for grade level mastery, such as syllabication and morphology, but will also spiral previous benchmarks, such as long vowel phonograms, to ensure gaps to Foundations are addressed. Planning and professional development will center around instructional practices that are explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory to create ideal environments for learning Foundations skills. Consistent routines as a delivery model for learning in this area will create automatic reading and writing habits beneficial for the execution of decoding and encoding with accuracy. In tandem, intentional placement of vocabulary and language acquisition will be applied to opportunities within Foundations Skills learning, as well as direct core instruction.

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)

As a result of the instructional practices specific to Reading and ELA, all grade levels, Kindergarten, First, and Second will have 50% or more of their students reading on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

As a result of the instructional practices specific to Reading and ELA, all grade levels, Third, Fourth, and Fifth will have 50% or more of their students reading on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

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.

The school's area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes using formal and informal ongoing aggressive progress monitoring. FAST and STAR PM1 and PM2 will be used to monitor broad looks at the progress of each grade level. For informal progress monitoring in Kindergarten, First and Second grade HCPS District Screener will be used three times a year. For more frequent progress monitoring, Unit tests following units of learning. Aggressive monitoring using laps/look fors anchored in the BEST benchmarks will be used on a weekly basis to progress monitor learning. For informal progress monitoring in Third, Fourth, and Fifth grade Spotlight Checkpoints and Unit tests following units of learning will be utilized. Aggressive monitoring using laps/look fors anchored in the BEST benchmarks will be used on a weekly basis to progress monitor learning. Immediate feedback will provide an opportunity for correct learning to cement in all grades.

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

Sheffield, Carmen, carmen.sheffield@hcps.net

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. Â§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?

The evidence-based practices of explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory instruction in the BEST Foundations Benchmarks for K-5 aligns with Florida's definition of evidence based and the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based Reading Plan.

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?

The evidence-based practices address the identified needs in that for students to be able to read and comprehend grade level text they will need to the keys to unlocking/decoding the language, as well as the language and vocabulary knowledge to support reading it once the decoding and encoding skills are mastered.

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
Literacy Coaching will model and develop the explicit, systematic, and multisensory learning needed to acquire Foundational skills for reading.	Sheffield, Carmen, carmen.sheffield@hcps.net
Assessment will be formal and informal by design. Formal captures will happen three times a year while more informal will happen daily, weekly, and monthly. Immediate capture and feedback for students will take place through aggressive monitoring and timely review and reflection will take place for larger assessment captures.	Sheffield, Carmen, carmen.sheffield@hcps.net
Professional Learning will be imbedded in collaboration sessions, PLCs and optional opportunities to address needs specific to each grade level around explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory instruction in Foundations.	Sheffield, Carmen, carmen.sheffield@hcps.net

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.

Our school mission is to provide a personalized and equitable education for all students. Our school's focus continues to be high expectations for all students and staff by having a growth mindset for learning. The top priority is equity in instructional practices and when making decisions about students.
Our school has built upon our PBIS system (PAWS - Problem Solver, Act Respectfully, Work Responsibility, Safety First). Throughout the day, students can earn PBIS Tickets when they follow the schoolwide expectations. Students can turn the tickets in for monthly PBIS activities and school events.
Stakeholders met to create a calendar of events (school meetings, PTA and SAC meetings and parent nights and events) toc continue to engage with our families, community and business partners. Students,

staff and volunteers will continue to be recognized for their accomplishments including student achievement, academic growth, leadership, and service. Stakeholders will be invited to celebrations.

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

Staff members at Kingswood, PTA, SAC, business partners ad students pay key roles in promoting positive achievement.