

Pinellas County Schools

# Kings Highway Elementary Magnet 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>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Kings Highway Elementary Magnet School

1715 KINGS HIGHWAY, Clearwater, FL 33755

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Garyn Boyd**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | <b>Black/African American Students</b><br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br><b>Multiracial Students</b><br><b>Students With Disabilities</b><br>White Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (68%)<br>2020-21: (52%)<br>2018-19: D (40%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

We are devoted to the individual learning and growth of the whole child

\*Relationships

\*Targeted Instruction

\*Equitable Systems

\*Individual Learning Targets

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

100% Student Success

We believe:

We must know our student's story.

That mindset truly matters.

Our students will meet or exceed our high expectations.

That intentional, grade level, standards based planning using ongoing student data is key.

We need to focus on student's unique learning needs and have a plan for each and every student.

We must stay focused on what will help us reach our goals.

Our students deserve our A game every single day.

We must prepare our students for college and career.

### 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 |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Boyd, Garyn       | Principal              |                                 |
| Williams, Randria | Assistant Principal    |                                 |
| Baker, Amy        | Psychologist           |                                 |
| Schutz, Sarah     | Attendance/Social Work |                                 |
| Yates, Jeb        | Behavior Specialist    |                                 |
|                   | Instructional Coach    | Other                           |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 6/16/2022, Garyn Boyd

**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.*

0

**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.*

10

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

26

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

280

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

6

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

5

### 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                              | 30          | 51 | 30 | 40 | 41 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 224   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 12 | 9  | 10 | 14 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 4  | 6  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 8  | 15 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 7  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 3  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
|  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

Thursday 6/23/2022

**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                              | 37          | 29 | 39 | 45 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 223   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 3  | 6  | 11 | 9  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 37          | 29 | 39 | 45 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 223   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 3  | 6  | 11 | 9  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

#### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 45%    |          |       | 44%    |          |       | 41%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 55%    |          |       | 56%    |          |       | 49%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 69%    |          |       | 70%    |          |       | 50%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 57%    |          |       | 50%    |          |       | 45%    | 61%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 84%    |          |       | 62%    |          |       | 33%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 88%    |          |       | 50%    |          |       | 19%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 77%    |          |       | 32%    |          |       | 43%    | 53%      | 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 | 35%    | 56%      | -21%                       | 58%   | -23%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 56%      | -6%                        | 58%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -35%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 54%      | -16%                       | 56%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -50%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 54%    | 62%      | -8%                        | 62%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 33%    | 60%      | -27%                       | 60%   | -27%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 54%      | -10%                       | 53%   | -9%                     |
| 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                                       | 32       | 40     |             | 36        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 55     |             | 69        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 50     | 70          | 46        | 81      | 80           | 73       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 68     |             | 68        | 84      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 50     |             | 77        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 58     | 64          | 55        | 83      | 86           | 76       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 45       | 50     |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       |        |             | 39        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 62     |             | 44        | 68      |              | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 55     |             | 56        | 55      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 41       |        |             | 53        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 50     |             | 49        | 63      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 13       | 53     | 54          | 32        | 50      |              | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 43       | 47     |             | 41        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 27       | 41     | 42          | 31        | 18      | 19           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 44     |             | 44        | 35      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 40       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 75     |             | 81        | 53      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 49     | 47          | 42        | 31      | 18           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 68  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 542 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 42  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 63  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 62  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 69  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| 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   | 68 |
| 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                                | 67 |
| 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?

The most obvious trend at KHEMS is that our ELA proficiency and gains do not equal that of our Math proficiency and gains. This has been the case for several years minus an outlying year where our Math L25 was extremely low. Another trend is that our Hispanic and White subgroups continue to outscore our African American scholars, Students With Disabilities, and our English Language Learners in both ELA and Math proficiency.

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

The greatest area in need of improvement across all subgroups and grade levels is in ELA in the area of Key Ideas and Details.

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

We believe that because our scholars are not meeting fluency expectations at their grade level, they are struggling comprehending grade level texts.

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

Our Math and Science data showed the most improvement for the 21-22 state testing season, with a 9 point increase in Math proficiency, and a 42 point increase in Science proficiency. Our LG in both ELA and Math increased with a 15 point gain in ELA, and a 28 point gain in Math.

During the 21-22 state assessment season our African American scholars showed an increase in learning gains in Math as compared to the previous testing season, with an increase of 13 percentage points. Our African American scholars also increased proficiency in 5th grade Science.

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

We were more intentional with planning this year than ever. Looked at ongoing data and made changes to instruction, especially in small group after every assessment, including formative assessments. We spent more time working with our scholars who were not showing growth no matter if they were L25 or already proficient, providing them with greater opportunities for small group and one on one academic conferences and instruction.

Our admin team continue to be a huge part of collaborative planning and implementation of differentiated student plans. Our teachers participated in one on one conferences with admin. twice during the year to talk about their scholar's data, who is moving / who isn't moving, barriers to scholars success, and to talk about strategies that will help their scholars grow towards proficiency.

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

We will add student led conferences to our plan this year. We feel that our data chats with scholars are working but by having the scholars conferences with their parent / guardian about their data, goals, plan, successes, etc., it's getting us one step closer to our scholars owning their data and their learning. We will add a greater focus on fluency in Reading and Math at all grade levels including Pre-K, being very intentional with who needs phonics, vocab., etc.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

We will continue with job embedded PD during grade level PLC 's for high yield strategies, Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards (the how), and for CRT strategies. We are adding outside the school day trainings for the following PD: Reading instruction on the topic of bringing the science of reading into the balanced literacy classroom, fluency instruction at all grade levels for Reading and Math, Best Standards in ELA and Math, new curriculum and assessment training, and planning to help meet the needs of our primary ELL and ESE scholars.

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

We will not have any additional services for the 22-23 school year but we will use those we have to get the best possible outcomes.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 14% (from 46 % to 60%), as measured by state assessment.  
Proficiency in Math will increase 6% (from 59% to 65%), as measured by the state assessment.  
Proficiency in Science will increase 2% (from 75% to 77%), as measured by the SSA.

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

Principal and AP attend all PLC's, collaborative planning sessions, data chats, and PD with teachers.  
Principal and AP will conduct walkthroughs.  
Principal and AP will meet with teachers individually throughout the school year to monitor their class data scholar by scholar.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Garyn Boyd (boydga@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Standards-aligned curricular materials and rigorous expectations for all students is the solid foundation needed to move each and every one of our scholars. This strategy is all about ensuring that we have solid CORE instruction so that our scholars are ready for next grade level expectations and that we push our scholars to grow beyond their max capacity.

**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.

Implement the instructional materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and B.E.S.T. Standards / NGSSS.

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

Make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

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

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard / benchmark.

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

Articulate and advance high expectations for all students consistent with the shared vision for teaching and learning.

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

Provide all teachers with PD sessions related to ELA and Math fluency standards and monitor the impact the fluency instruction has on our scholars throughout the school year.

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

Provide all teachers with PD sessions related to ELA and Math fluency standards and monitor the impact the fluency instruction has on our scholars throughout the school year.

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

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

ELL student proficiency in ELA will increase 10% (from 43% to 53%), as measured by the state assessment.  
ELL student proficiency in Math will increase from 2% (from 68% to 70%), as measured by the stated assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Principal and AP will participate in student-led conference planning sessions.  
Principal and AP will conduct walkthroughs during student-led conferences.  
Principal and AP will survey both the scholars and their participating adult after each student led conference session.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Ongoing goal setting and celebrating successes is hugely important when trying to motivate students to reach their greatest potential. We want our scholars to feel they have control over their successes and to feel that they are part of a community of learners that want the best from everyone. We want our scholars to see that hard work, grit, and high expectations can take them to places they never thought they could reach.

**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.

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

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



Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

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

**#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**

Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Black student proficiency in ELA will increase 13% (from 37% to 50%), as measured by the state assessment.  
Black student proficiency in Math will increase 10% (from 46% to 56%), as measured by the stated assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Principal and AP will participate in student-led conference planning sessions.  
Principal and AP will conduct walkthroughs during student-led conferences.  
Principal and AP will survey both the scholars and their participating adult after each student led conference session.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Ongoing goal setting and celebrating successes is hugely important when trying to motivate students to reach their greatest potential. We want our scholars to feel they have control over their successes and to feel that they are part of a community of learners that want the best from everyone. We want our scholars to see that hard work, grit, and high expectations can take them to places they never thought they could reach.

**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.

Implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

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

Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

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

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

SWD proficiency in ELA will increase 10% (from 32% to 42%), as measured by the state assessment.

SWD proficiency in Math will increase from 10% (from 36 % to 46%), as measured by the stated assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Principal and AP will participate in student-led conference planning sessions.  
Principal and AP will conduct walkthroughs during student-led conferences.  
Principal and AP will survey both the scholars and their participating adult after each student led conference session.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Ongoing goal setting and celebrating successes is hugely important when trying to motivate students to reach their greatest potential. We want our scholars to feel they have control over their successes and to feel that they are part of a community of learners that want the best from everyone. We want our scholars to see that hard work, grit, and high expectations can take them to places they never thought they could reach.

**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.

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

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

Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

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

## RAISE

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Our Area of Focus for 1st and 2nd grade is, instructional practice related to standard-aligned instruction. Our evidence-based strategy for this focus are, develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes.

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

Our Area of Focus for 3rd - 5th grade scholars is instructional practice related to standard-aligned instruction and ESSA subgroups Black and SWD. Our evidence-based strategy for these focus areas are: Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students, and celebrate student's growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous growth.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Proficiency in 1st grade ELA will increase 24% from 26% to 50%, as measure by the state ELA assessment.

Proficiency in 2nd grade ELA will increase 26% from 24% to 50%, as measure by the state ELA assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Proficiency in 3rd grade ELA will increase 16%, from 44% to 60%, as measured by the state ELA assessment.

Proficiency in 4th grade ELA will increase 21%, from 29% to 50%, as measured by the state ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Principal and AP attend all PLC's, collaborative planning sessions, data chats, and PD with teachers, where we will target the specific area needed based on the gaps.

Principal and AP will conduct fidelity checks.

Principal and AP will meet with teachers individually throughout the school year to monitor their class data scholar by scholar.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd, Garyn, boydga@pcsb.org

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Literacy footprints

SIPPS

Read Naturally

Fry Sight Word Fluency and Phonics

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

All of the curriculum materials that we will utilize to reach the desired student outcomes are research based materials that have a positive track record when used with fidelity for students who require what the program is intended for. These programs have been used successfully by other schools in our district, and therefore recommended. We are developing an intervention map to help our teachers / staff determine which strategy / program is the right one for specific scholars.

**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               |
|--|---|
| Our 3rd - 5th grade scholars who did not score a level 3 or above on the state ELA assessment will participate in ongoing fluency instruction and progress monitoring to meet their individual needs. They will set goals, track their data, and present their portfolios to their parent / guardian during student-led conferences. | Boyd, Garyn,<br>boydga@pcsb.org                 |
| K-2nd Grade - Provide regular structures for planning / PLC's where teachers regularly engage in data / student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal for upcoming lessons including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.  | Williams, Randria,<br>williamsstubbbsr@pcsb.org |

### 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.

A positive school climate starts with the school's administration and flows right into staff, students, family, and community, to create a shared vision, mission, and to ensure that high expectations are part of everything we do.

We take the time to develop relationships with all of our stakeholders through opportunities to communicate in person via family events, student-led conferences, arrival / dismissal, and during small focused groups like SAC, ESOL parent cafe, etc.

The moment our scholars walk onto campus they know that they are loved and that they are at KHEMS to learn and grow, and to reach their goals and beyond. KHEMS has a school wide language of success that includes behavior expectations in the form of guidelines for success, character traits, leadership traits, goal setting, celebrations, and bucket filling. We start each day with a school wide announcement reminding students of the LION WAY and, that at Kings Highway we gain the knowledge to go to college! We remind our scholars daily that the choices we make effect our today and our tomorrow.

During the 21-22 school year we implemented a Student of the Month award based on our monthly SEL lessons / trait that were conducted by our Social Worker and School Psychologist. Our SOM winners and their families celebrated at a monthly movie night just for them. We will continue our mentor program for our Tier 3 scholars but add an official check in folder.

For the 22-23 school year we intend to add an initiative that will target Tier 2 behavior scholars. This will include a check in check out sheet for all Tier 2 scholars and targeted group counseling based on need (impulse control, peer relationships, anxiety, etc.). 70% of our Tier 2 scholars will reach their monthly goal at least 6/9 months during the school year as measured by our Target Behavior Rubric.

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



Scholars, their families, our staff, and the community are all stakeholders at KHEMS.

**Scholars:** KHEMS scholars promote a positive school culture by participating in our magnet theme activities such as, spirit days, home STEAM challenges, sharing of completed challenges on daily news show, joining our STEAM before and after school clubs, working towards their academic and conduct goals, following our guidelines for success, completing daily agenda, and leading their own student-led conference.

**Parents / Guardians:** Our families have the opportunity to give input into school improvement initiatives and family involvement activities several times a year. They have the opportunity to participate in, at home STEAM challenges, parent PD sessions, Great American Teach In, student-led and teacher led conferences, family curriculum / STEAM events, SAC, and through DOJO, email, and student agenda.

**Teachers & Staff:** Our teachers and staff play a huge role in the positive culture of KHEMS. Like the students, our teachers and staff walk the LION Way, modeling, teaching, and reteaching our guidelines for success, character traits, goal setting, and celebrations. They greet their scholars warmly every day to show our scholars that every day is a new day filled with promise and learning. Our teachers & staff represent KHEMS and the district every time they communicate with families and the community. That communication is consistent, focused on student learning and student success. Our teachers and staff have the opportunity throughout the school year to give input and feedback, and to join several different leadership teams that drive change at KHEMS.

**Community:** The KHEMS community is the City of Clearwater, R'Club, local businesses, and the Artz for Life program. We participate in their events / activities and they participate in ours. We ask our community partners for input and feedback regarding various school improvement initiatives and activities.