Pinellas County Schools

Kings Highway Elementary Magnet 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 13

IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 22

V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence 0

VI. Title I Requirements 22

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 0

Kings Highway Elementary Magnet School

1715 KINGS HIGHWAY, Clearwater, FL 33755

http://www.kings-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us/

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.

Mission: Educate and Prepare
Each Student for College, Career and Life
(at least 1 year's growth for each scholar).

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

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
Boyd, Garyn	Principal	
Baker, Amy	Psychologist	
Williams, Randria	Assistant Principal	

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.

Leadership team (SBLT) is involved in all aspects of school improvement throughout the school year. This is done during our weekly SBLT meetings.
Teachers are involved in all aspects of school improvement throughout the school year. Input is gathered during weekly PLC's, staff meetings, and surveys.
Students are involved in our SIP process by providing feedback on student experience factors such as events, celebrations, goals, ideas for improvement, likes and dislikes.
Parents and the community are provided opportunities to give input into our SIP focus during SAC, parent / student conferences, at family events, and via surveys.
We used the input from all of our stakeholders to develop our SIP and Title 1 plan.

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 goals and action plans will be regularly monitored during our weekly SBLT meetings, parent meetings when we give "how are we doing" information, grade level team data chats, individual teacher data chats, getting student feedback through the school year, and by surveying all stake holders.

Demographic Data

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	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
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	2021-22: A 2019-20: I 2018-19: D 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	2	3	1	7	5	3	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	7	1	5	1	1	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	9	1	1	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	5	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	3	5	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	3	7	8	3	5	0	0	0	30

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	10	6	18	17	15	0	0	0	66

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	9	10	14	5	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	6	1	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	5	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	7	1	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	3	1	0	0	0	9
	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	1	1	8	5	1	0	0	0	16

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	5	0	0	0	5
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	12	9	10	14	5	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	6	1	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	5	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	7	1	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	3	1	0	0	0	9
	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	1	1	8	5	1	0	0	0	16

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	5	0	0	0	5
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	45	55	56	41	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	55	62	61	49	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69	55	52	50	54	53
Math Achievement*	57	62	60	45	61	63
Math Learning Gains	84	65	64	33	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	88	54	55	19	48	51
Science Achievement*	77	57	51	43	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	67			54		

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	42			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	67			

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)

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	45	55	69	57	84	88	77					67
SWD	32	40		36	60							
ELL	44	55		69	82							67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	50	70	46	81	80	73					
HSP	52	68		68	84							73
MUL												
PAC												

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
WHT	54	50		77	90							
FRL	45	58	64	55	83	86	76					

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	44	56	70	50	62	50	32					67
SWD	45	50		50								
ELL	33			39								67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	62		44	68		20					
HSP	53	55		56	55		36					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41			53								
FRL	40	50		49	63		30					71

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	41	49	50	45	33	19	43					54
SWD	13	53	54	32	50		27					
ELL	43	47		41	40							54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	41	42	31	18	19	29					
HSP	46	44		44	35		50					54
MUL	40			60								
PAC												
WHT	71	75		81	53							
FRL	37	49	47	42	31	18	42					52

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	66%	57%	9%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	66%	1%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	60%	8%	51%	17%

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.

Our ELA was the lowest with a 59% proficiency. This was however a 14 percent increase from the previous year's ELA proficiency.

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

Science showed a 10% decrease from the prior year. The 5th grade cohort this year came to 5th grade with just a 29% proficiency in ELA. Not only did we have the heavy lift of teaching / reteaching all of the

3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Science standards, we also had so much work to do regarding building this cohort of students up, filling in gaps, and building their stamina.

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.

KHEMS is above the state average in all Core subjects. The subject that is closest to the state average is ELA. Our ELA 3+ is 59% and the state is 54%.

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

ELA showed the most improvement this year with a 14% increase. We strongly believe that the work we are doing in primary is making an impact.

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

1. 3rd grade level 1 scholars in ELA and Math
2. Attendance regarding the number of students with less than 90% attendance

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

1. School wide proficiency in ELA
2. Attendance

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 ELA

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.

The rationale for this focus area is that 41% of our scholars have not yet reached proficiency on their grade level FAST Reading Assessment.

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

We will increase proficiency from 59% to 70% on the 23-24 PM 3 Reading FAST Assessment.

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

The actions steps for this goal will be monitored using OPM data, fidelity check data, and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

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.)

Systematic explicit literacy instruction across all grade levels using resources aligned to the Science of Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our teachers need to be provided with the tools and knowledge to pinpoint the reasons why a given student is struggling in reading and have the skills necessary to fill in the gaps.

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 and administration will participate in ongoing PD and coaching aligned with the UF Flamingo Literacy instructional model.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: Teachers and administration will complete the first year of this literacy PD by May 24, 2024.

Teachers will conduct explicit small group instruction daily using the Flamingo literacy model.

Person Responsible: Randria Williams (williamsstubbsr@pcsb.org)

By When: September 5th, 2022

Teachers and administration will complete the UFLI modules to learn how to implement this explicit and systematic phonics program with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Teachers will implement the UFLI Explicit and Systematic Phonics Program with fidelity in whole group and in small groups, using data from the administration of the Core Phonics Survey and or the PAST assessment to determine starting points.

Person Responsible: Randria Williams (williamsstubbsr@pcsb.org)

By When: August 17, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

The rationale for this focus area is that 36% of our scholars have not yet reached proficiency on their grade level FAST Math Assessment.

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

We will increase proficiency from 64% to 70% on the 23-24 PM 3 FAST Math Assessment.

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

The actions steps for this goal will be monitored using OPM data, fidelity check data, and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

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.)

Systematic and explicit fluency instruction across all grade levels using resources that support best practices for building fact fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math fluency contributes to students' ability to solve more difficult problems quicker and more accurately and it builds confidence in students' math ability.

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 and administrators will participate in PD that is specific to teaching systematic explicit strategies for increasing mathematical fluency led by our district Math Supervisor.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: By October 6, 2023

Teachers will implement learned strategies for teaching systematic explicit strategies for increasing mathematical fluency with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing implementation.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

The rationale for this focus area is that 33% of our scholars have not yet reached proficiency on their grade level State Science Assessment.

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

We will increase proficiency from 67% to 70% on the 23-24 State Science Assessment.

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

The actions steps for this goal will be monitored using district assessment data and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

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.)

Focus on content specific vocabulary across all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Vocabulary plays a crucial role in science because it is at the heart of science learning and knowledge building.

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 collaboratively plan to develop Science vocabulary activities that includes strategies such as gamifying, concept mapping, and sketching, etc.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Teachers will implement strategies such as gamifying, concept mapping, and sketching with fidelity for every Science big idea.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

Research shows that students perform better and are more likely to succeed when they show up. Poor attendance can create learning gaps. This can lead to students feeling overwhelmed and subsequently missing more school due to this stress or anxiety.

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

We intend to decrease the number of scholars who have less than 90% average daily attendance by 50% from 21 to 10 scholars for the 23-24 school year.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by administration and the school social worker at our bi-weekly Child Study Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

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.)

The targeted students and families will receive personalized Tier 2 interventions designed to remove barriers to attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 interventions recognize that some students face additional challenges and barriers to arriving at school on time, every day. These interventions are tailored to meet individual student needs and include strategies for identifying and addressing specific obstacles.

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.

Principal and Social Worker will present attendance data to SBLT on a biweekly basis.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: Biweekly starting August 17, 2023

SBLT will assign a personalized Tier 2 strategy for each targeted scholar on our list and assign a member of SBLT to implement and monitor the strategy for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Amy Baker (bakeram@pcsb.rog)

By When: August 17, 2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

The rationale for this focus area is that 45% of our African American scholars have not yet reached proficiency on their grade level FAST Reading Assessment.

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

We will increase proficiency from 55% to 70% on the 23-24 PM 3 Reading FAST Assessment.

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

The actions steps for this goal will be monitored using ongoing Writing data, administrator participation in student data chats, and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

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.)

Our 4th and 5th grade scholars will participate in peer coaching and editing using a Writing Rubric combined with a self-monitoring goal sheet for the specific areas on the State Writing Assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Employing peer coaching within a classroom will help students develop crucial coaching skills such as active listening, asking meaningful questions, and giving and receiving developmental feedback.

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.

Dedicate 4th and 5th grade PLC time to developing the following documents to use in this process: Writing rubric, self-assessment, and document to track writing performance based on the areas of the state Writing Assessment.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: September 15th

Schedule / Calendar out 4th and 5th grade Writing Plan to include when to implement the Writing Assessments, when Peer Coaching will occur, and when individual student data chats will take place.

Person Responsible: Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

By When: September 15th

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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.

KHEMS will disseminate the SIP focus areas and the progress of our goals to our stakeholders in a variety of ways. We do put all important information on our website, but we also communicate it on Dojo, School Messenger emails, at SAC and at our State of the School function, during family events like Bring your Dad to School Day, and during Family STEAM events.

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))

KHEMS will continue to build positive relationships with our parents and families by gaining their input on a variety of topics, including how they want to be part of the KHEMS learning community. We will continue hosting events that help build and foster a positive community, like, Bring Your Dad to School Day, Grandparents Day, STEAM Family Events, Curriculum Showcase, and Student Led Conferences.

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))

The one new focus for us will be the implementation of systematic explicit literacy instruction across all grade levels using resources aligned to the Science of Reading (UFLI and Flamingo). Our teachers and administration will patriciate in yearlong PD to support the UFLI and Flamingo instruction.
We will continue the intentional work we have been doing at each grade level to ensure that standard based data is carefully tracked so that students receive the instruction they need to successfully master

their grade level standards. This includes planning to meet the needs of on and above grade level scholars.

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))

All SIP activities are tightly aligned with our Title 1 plan. We partner with our district Title 1 department to ensure that we are meeting all Federal and State requirements.

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))

KHEMS has partnered with Directions for Mental Health and Suncoast Counseling to provide onsite counseling for targeted scholars. In addition to the later, next school year we are partnering with the USF School Psychology department to provide additional supports for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 scholars in both SEL and Counseling.

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))

NA

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).

Our Site Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meets weekly to discuss Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 academic and behavior. We designate the meetings for either academic or behavior and cover all three Tiers. Our School Psychologists, one administrator, and the teacher attends parent meetings where plans are developed to meet the needs of targeted scholars. At SBLT meetings, the interventionist who is tracking ongoing data to support individualized plans for targeted scholars updates the team on how each student is progressing.

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))

Our ongoing PD takes place during our grade level PLC's and during our school wide after school PLC. We offer at least one optional book study each year, we send grade level leaders to district reading and Math PD throughout the school year. These curriculum leaders share what they learned during our grade level or school wide PLC's. Our Reading and Math Coaches and administration provide ongoing PD for our teachers during PLC's or in outside the school day PD. This year, our teachers and administrators will participate in a yearlong PD on systematic explicit literacy instruction that is aligned with the Science of Reading.

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))

We will continue to implement our transition activities for our pre-k scholars and their parents. This includes parent workshops and transition to kindergarten events. This work also includes the implementation of a systemic explicit literacy instructional plan, where teachers teach, collect data, and share results with parents.