

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kingswood Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sheffield, Carmen	Principal	Responsible for the full plant operations of the school and student achievement.
Ritchie, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Responsible for student achievement and assists with full plant operations.
Andersen, Tawnya	Math Coach	Assists with responsibility of student achievement in Math (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).
Kenny, Dianna	SAC Member	Chair of the School Advisory Council
Nazario, Marta	ELL Compliance Specialist	Assists with responsibility of student achievement for ELLs (coaching and collaboration with teachers, pulling student groups, compliance of ELL program)

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Meetings were held at the end of the year and during pre-planning with the entire staff to discuss EOY data trends, strengths and areas of focus. During pre-planning, the SAC was involved in analyzing the

data trends. The leadership team met to discuss the input of the staff and SAC utilizing their input to write goals. The goals were then shared with staff and SAC for feedback. Final product was a collaboration of staff, SAC and leadership team.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored quarterly. During monthly PLC meetings, data trends will be discussed. During planning sessions and PLCs, action steps will be monitored and analyzed to determine effectiveness. Quarterly, data and implementation of plans will be discussed and updates/changes to the plan will be made.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	35	27	18	18	24	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	31	28	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	20	29	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	28	28	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	30	27	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	4	9	16	0	0	0	31

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	26	21	24	27	16	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	26	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	12	20	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	12	1	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	26	21	24	27	16	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	26	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	12	20	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	28	12	10	12	0	0	0	82

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	12	1	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	31	50	53	42	53	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				57			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			47		
Math Achievement*	37	56	59	51	50	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				75			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			17		
Science Achievement*	29	50	54	31	59	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	59	59	67			64		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	188
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	1	1
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	31			37			29					58
SWD	14			14							3	
ELL	16			31							4	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			30			8				4	
HSP	28			32			24				5	58
MUL	18			36							2	
PAC												
WHT	46			49			45				4	
FRL	29			36			27				5	62

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	57	59	51	75	73	31					67
SWD	21	42	42	24	58	62	17					
ELL	20	43	50	42	85	82	20					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	56		34	83	80	18					
HSP	39	54	57	47	79	78	31					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	63		66	62		35					
FRL	40	57	61	47	74	72	29					62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	47	47	41	32	17	32					64
SWD	19	18		8	0		8					
ELL	35	50		32	21		36					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	29		21	29		7					
HSP	46	48	40	39	31		38					63
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	59	50		51	36		38					
FRL	43	41	47	37	29	18	30					60

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	61%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	25%	47%	-22%	51%	-26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science data showed the lowest performance (31% proficiency in 2022 to 25% proficiency in 2023). The contributing factors were teachers' lack of understanding of the Science standards in 5th grade and the progression of the standards in previous grades leading to 5th grade standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math data showed the greatest decline (51% proficiency on 2022 FSA to 40% proficiency on 2023 FAST). The contributing factors were teachers' and students' knowledge of the new benchmarks.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (State FAST 2023 - 54% compared to 33% proficiency). Our previous year's FSA score was 38% proficiency. FAST data for 2023 was at 33%. Factors that contributed to the gaps were students lacking foundational skills needed for mastery and teacher's knowledge of the new benchmarks.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math data showed the most improvement. The number of students in 3rd grade that were proficient increased from 36% in 2022 to 44% in 2023. The students who had 36% proficiency in 3rd grade increased to 42% in 4th grade.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two areas of concern are the percentages of students scoring level 1 on Math and Reading FAST in 5th grade.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increasing Science proficiency levels, increasing the number of students scoring 3+ in ELA and Math, increasing attendance rates (specifically in 1st, 2nd and 5th).

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Rational: Based on FAST data, our proficiency decreased compared to FSA proficiency in all subject areas. On the 2022 Reading FSA, 38% of our students were proficient compared to 33% proficiency on the 2023 Reading FAST. On the 2022 Math FSA, 51% of our students were proficient compared to 40% proficiency on the 2023 Math FAST. On the 2022 Science Statewide Assessment, 31% of our students were proficient compared to 25% proficiency on the 2023 Science Statewide Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal in math is to achieve 51% proficiency on the 2024 FAST. Our goal in science is to achieve 46% proficiency on the 2024 Science Statewide Assessment. Our goal is to achieve 44% proficiency on the 2024 Reading FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will plan and implement lessons aligned to the benchmarks. Coaches will support teachers in creating benchmark-aligned lesson plans as well as modeling and providing feedback related to students' understanding of the benchmark. Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs and provide targeted, specific feedback based on our instructional focus, priority, and look-fors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Florida Science Standards and BEST Benchmarks to create high-quality, benchmark-aligned lesson plans. They will focus on coaching and modeling instruction as needed (no less than once a month). Administration will meet weekly with coaches to determine next steps for teachers.

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

By When: Ongoing, August through May

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on our 2022 data, we had 26% of our students who were absent at least 10% or more of the total days (below 90% attendance).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease the percentage of students absent 10% or more of the total days from 26% to 15% (about 48 students).

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor and track students with a high number of absences weekly, providing support to all families as well as incentives for students who are showing improved attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Sheffield (carmen.sheffield@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

i-Ready personalized instruction for Math and Reading, UFLI for K-2 foundational skills in Reading,

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will actively monitor students' attendance weekly, reaching out to families of students with attendance issues. Support will be given to families of students with attendance issues. Incentive programs will be put into place for students to encourage increased attendance. Attendance referrals will be implemented for students with issues to track and monitor.

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

By When: Ongoing, August through May

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Not a ATSI, TSI, or CSI school

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 2022-2023, our Kindergarten, First and Second grades had 45%, 40% and 53% of students reading at or above grade level, respectively. Indicating that 34% of our Kindergarten students, 51% of our First Grade students, and 36% of our Second Grade Students were reading at an intervention or urgent intervention level. For the 2023-2024 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 related to Reading/ELA

For 2022-2023, our Third, Fourth, and Fifth grades had 31%, 33% and 33% of students reading at or above grade level, respectively. For the 2023-2024 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

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 Measurable Outcomes

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

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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 DIBELS, Core Phonics Survey, and/or UFLI Progress Monitoring Assessments 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

Description:

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?

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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 embedded 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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan will be shared with parents and stakeholders on our school website (<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/kingswood>). The SIP will also be shared during parent meetings in September and March, as well as once a month at SAC Meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We have a calendar of events scheduled for the year including once a month SAC meetings, conference nights scheduled 3 times this school year, several parent nights focused on academics (including Math, Science and Literacy nights, and a Student Led Conferencing night).

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will utilize instructional coaches to build teacher capacity with understanding the benchmarks and implementing best teaching practices. Teachers will participate in professional development specific to the instructional needs of the teachers based on trend data. We will utilize resource teachers and personnel (non-homeroom teachers, administrators) to work in small groups with students to improve student outcomes.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan was developed using the guidelines under Title 1.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

-

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

-

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

-

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

-