

Escambia County School District

# Kingsfield Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Kingsfield Elementary School

900 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

[www.escambiaschools.org](http://www.escambiaschools.org)

## Demographics

**Principal: Quinn Evans**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Kingsfield Elementary School

900 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

[www.escambiaschools.org](http://www.escambiaschools.org)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>45%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>34%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.**

Kingsfield Elementary is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their full potential through personalized learning. We set high expectations for all students. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Reaching the hearts and minds of every student every day.

### 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
Evans, Quinn	Principal	Principal: Provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/Rtl components. Work to ensure the safety of all faculty, staff and students while working to include all stakeholders in the decision making process.
Coward, Maureen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/Rtl components. Work to ensure the safety of all faculty, staff and students while working to include all stakeholders in the decision making process.
Windham, Chelsea	School Counselor	School Counselor: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/Rtl components. School counselor and the school psychologist will conduct assessment of Rti skills of the school staff and communicate with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.
Shelnut, Stacey	Other	Rtl Coordinator: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/Rtl components. Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Venable, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Fleming, Rhonda	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Browning, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Johnson, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rowe, Kenli	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Goodin, Gabrielle	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Eyre, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher: Provide information about the instruction to students with disabilities, participate in student data collection, collaborate with the general education teachers and other staff to implement Tier 3 interventions and provide accommodations and supports to the general curriculum.
Maddox, Amy	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 8/10/2022, Quinn Evans

**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.*

2

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

65

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

876

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

14

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

16

**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	135	150	151	164	130	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	861
Attendance below 90 percent	11	21	26	19	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	7	7	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	3	2	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	6	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/28/2022

**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	139	141	159	142	115	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	10	34	25	19	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	9	10	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	19	12	19	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
	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	4	7	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	3	13	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	139	141	159	142	115	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	10	34	25	19	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	9	10	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	19	12	19	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
	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	4	7	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	3	13	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	62%	51%	56%				62%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						49%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	46%	50%				67%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						66%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						57%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	52%	59%				63%	54%	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	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	75%	55%	20%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	53%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	30	39	27	37	31	14	48				
BLK	37	52	38	31	47	50	47				
HSP	53			50							
MUL	61	52		57	52		40				
WHT	68	60	39	70	58	39	78				
FRL	54	56	38	47	46	39	56				
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	25	53	58	25	5		26				
BLK	34	29		28	14		38				
HSP	44			50			50				
MUL	61			67							
WHT	64	70	80	67	58	31	82				
FRL	50	49	36	44	33	21	64				
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	20	44	52	36	48	48	26				
BLK	42	63	53	47	68	67	54				
HSP	65	40		61	67						
MUL	60	50		65	64		64				
WHT	65	47	52	71	65	52	66				
FRL	51	49	50	54	64	53	61				

**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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	52
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	59
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	48
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?

ELA achievement for the ESSA subgroup of white students for 2022 was 31 points higher than the ESSA subgroup of black students. The gap between math achievement is even greater for those subgroups with a disparity of 39 points. The subgroup of Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance (32%) in ELA achievement on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. While the subgroup of Students with Disabilities increased by 5 points from 2021 from 25% to 30% this group still has room for much growth. SWD increased by 25% points in Math achievement. The BLK subgroup increased 3% points in both ELA and math achievement. HSP subgroup increased by 9% points in ELA achievement and remained constant at 50% in math achievement. MUL remained at 61% in ELA and decreased by 10% in math. WHT increased by 4% in ELA and 3% in math. FRL increased by 4% in ELA and 3% in math. Science proficiency for SWD increased from 26% to 48%. Overall, all subgroups remained the same or increased in ELA achievement and only one subgroup decreased in math achievement.

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

Based on available school grade data and progress monitoring data, the data component demonstrating the greatest need for improvement in ELA proficiency remains the subgroup of students with disabilities.



This subgroup is below 41% in both ELA and Math achievement, learning gains, and lower quartile. Based on FSA/FSAA data from 2022 ELA lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 was at 36% proficiency and Math lowest 25% was at 42% proficiency.

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

One key factor in this subgroup was the pandemic. SWD were affected during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. Another contributing factor is the hiring of some new ESE resource teachers each year. Many students were remote or missed instruction due to COVID illness or exposure. Education is still feeling the effects of this and the loss of face to face instruction. Programs and schedules for SWD need to be analyzed and adapted to meet the needs of each student in this subgroup. An emphasis will be placed on lower quartile students during data meetings.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was math across grades 3-5 was in the subgroup of student with disabilities. This subgroup increased by 25% points in math achievement and 26% points in math learning gains. Economically disadvantaged students (FRL) increased 28% points in math learning gains.

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

Tutoring was provided to address concerns and to remediate skill deficits for students due to the loss of instructional time. Small group math groups were also implemented. Reflex Math, a math fluency program was also purchased and utilized.

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

The RTi coordinator will work with all teachers to ensure that research based strategies and interventions are being implemented. Administration along with the RTi coordinator will ensure all teachers are conducting meaningful and differentiated small group instruction. Administration will ensure all ESE teachers are trained in Phonics Chip Kit and/or Souday Systems to use as interventions.

**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.**

Phonics Chip Kit/Souday System training  
iReady Training  
Professional Development provided by the ELA department  
Data Meetings  
HMH Training throughout the year

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

Continued support will be provided by the school based RTi coordinator. School based professional development and support will be provided by the ELA department. iReady training will continue to assist teachers in individualizing each student's learning path, as well as using reports to determine mastery of skills. In Kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grades STAR data will be monitored to ensure growth and to determine areas in need of improvement. Administration will conduct walk throughs to ensure high quality instruction.

**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 ELA**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

In analyzing 2022 FSA/FSAA data, 36% of students in the lowest 25% demonstrated proficiency when assessed in English Language Arts. Students in the ESSA subgroups of Black and Students with Disabilities had low proficiency rates. BLK students were at 37% proficient and SWD were at 30% proficient in ELA.

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

Students in the lowest 25th percentile will increase from 36% to 50% or above. The ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities will increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 50% on the ELA FAST assessment. The ESSA subgroup of Black students will increase ELA proficiency from 37% to 50% on the ELA FAST assessment. ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 62% to 70% or above.

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

Data from iReady and FAST will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed after each assessment. Administration and the RTi coordinator will meet with teachers to break down data and remediate students in the standards that have not yet been mastered. Administration will meet with the Rti coordinator to discuss Tier 1 instruction and to discuss the individual needs of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

\*Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies.  
 \*Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

The panel identified 10 studies that demonstrated that teaching reading comprehension strategies to primary grade students has positive effects on comprehension when measured by standardized tests and researcher-created measures. The specific strategies discussed in this recommendation

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

can improve comprehension when taught individually or in combination with other effective comprehension strategies.  
 Activating prior knowledge/predicting  
 Questioning  
 Visualization  
 Monitoring/Clarifying/fix-up  
 Inferencing  
 Retelling

The 18 studies that found positive effects contributed to the moderate level of evidence; the remainder of this paragraph focuses on those studies. Nine of these studies had interventions that included all three components of Recommendation 4.

\* As students read orally, model strategies, scaffold, and provide feedback to

support  
accurate and efficient word identification.  
\*Teach students to self-monitor their understanding of the text and to self-correct  
word-reading errors.  
\* Provide opportunities for oral reading practice with feedback to develop fluent and  
accurate reading with expression.

### 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.

All ESE teachers will be trained in Sonday Systems for Tier III instruction  
Have 1st and 2nd grade teachers trained in Phonics Chip Kit  
Ensure small group meaningful instruction is occurring in all classroom  
Follow up with classroom walkthroughs  
Meet with gen ed and ESE teachers to review data after each assessment  
Continue schoolwide AR program

**Person Responsible**      Maureen Cowart (mcowart@ecsdf1.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

In analyzing 2022 FSA/FSAA data, 42% of students in the lowest 25% demonstrated proficiency when assessed in Math. Students in the ESSA subgroups of Black and Students with Disabilities had low proficiency rates. BLK students were at 31% proficient and SWD were at 37% proficient in Math.

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

Students in the lowest 25th percentile will increase from 42% to 50% or above. The ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities will increase Math proficiency from 37% to 50% on the Math FAST assessment. The ESSA subgroup of Black students will increase ELA proficiency from 31% to 50% on the ELA FAST assessment. ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 62% to 70% or above.

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

Data from iReady and FAST will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed after each assessment. Administration and the RTi coordinator will meet with teachers to break down data and remediate students in the math standards that have not yet been mastered. Administration will meet with the Rti coordinator to discuss Tier 1 instruction and to discuss the individual needs of Tier II and Tier III students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Recommendation 3. Instruction during the intervention should be explicit and systematic. This includes providing models of proficient problem solving, verbalization of thought processes, guided practice, corrective feedback, and frequent cumulative review.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The results of six randomized controlled trials of mathematics interventions show extensive support for various combinations of the following components of explicit and systematic instruction: teacher demonstration, student verbalization, guided practice, and corrective feedback.

- \*Ensure that instructional materials are systematic and explicit. In particular, they should include numerous clear models of easy and difficult problems, with accompanying teacher think-alouds.
- \* Provide students with opportunities to solve problems in a group and communicate problem-solving strategies.
- \*. Ensure that instructional materials include cumulative review in each session.

**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.

- Ensure small group meaningful instruction is occurring in all classrooms
- Follow up with classroom walkthroughs
- Meet with gen ed and ESE teachers to review data after each assessment and plan next steps
- Identify lower quartile students and target instruction towards standards mastery
- Reflex Math utilized in grades 2-5 for math fluency

**Person Responsible** Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfi.us)

### **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.**

Kingsfield Elementary is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their full potential through personalized learning. We set high expectations for all students. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

We encourage and train volunteers to help teachers and staff members.

We are a Capturing Kids' Hearts School and encourage all teachers to greet students each morning as they enter their rooms.

Cub Cash is given out to students who go above and beyond and are model citizens.

Faculty and Staff are treated monthly by our PTA.

Food trucks or outside food is set up monthly to treat faculty and staff.

Kingsfield Elementary conducts School Advisory Council Meetings throughout the year to receive input from stakeholders and share news about the school.

Suite 360 is used for social-emotional learning and behavior intervention.

Family STEM night and a Family Art night are held to encourage family participation in the school program.

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

Gulf Coast Kid's House presents "Child Safety Matters" each year.

FDLE, The Sheriff's Department, and the Police Department present a cyberbullying program to grades 3-5.

Partners in Education provide treats and incentives to students, faculty, and staff.

PTA has weekly work days to assist teachers with material preparation.

UWF and PSC have practicum students and student teachers that work in classrooms as they learn about the teaching profession.

Tate High School has Early Childhood Academy student that work in classrooms in grades K-2.