

Pinellas County Schools

KINGS HIGHWAY ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 17
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 18
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 27
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 31
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 36
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 37

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Our Mission is: 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

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Garyn Boyd

boydga@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversees the SIP

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Stephan Lane

lanees@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports the Principal in all SIP oversight.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Debra Layton

laytonde@pcsb.org

Position Title

Curriculum Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitates the Math & Science goal in the SIP.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Joseph Rober

roberjpcsb.org

Position Title

MTSS Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitates the Early Warning academic goals.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Tawny Baird

bairdt@pcsb.org

Position Title

Library Media Technology Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support for all SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Annie Zuercher

Zuerchera@pcsb.org

Position Title

PELI Literacy Coach K-2

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support all K-3rd grade ELA SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #7**Employee's Name****Position Title****Job Duties and Responsibilities**

No Answer Entered

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 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,

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for

those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The SIP goals and action plans will be regularly monitored during our biweekly 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.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	100.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A 2020-21: C

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment	35	25	24	41	24	31				180
Absent 10% or more school days	1	14	8	8	7	6				44
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	3	1				7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	0				2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0				6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	5	12	0	0				17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	2	7	10	4	0				24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	7	1	7	2	7				25
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	1	5	0				6

Current Year 2025-26

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	2	6	5	4	1				18

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	1	0	2	0	0				3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days		6	10	9	3	14				42
One or more suspensions		1		3	4					8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				4	1					5
Course failure in Math				5	2	1				8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				2	2	4				8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				1	2	3				6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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			1	1	1	5				8

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year					1					1
Students retained two or more times				2						2

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	75	64	59	65	61	57	57	54	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	73	67	59	76	63	58	61	54	53
ELA Learning Gains	59	62	60	67	64	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	79	59	56	67	62	57			
Math Achievement*	76	69	64	66	66	62	64	61	59
Math Learning Gains	73	67	63	73	68	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57	56	51	87	58	52			
Science Achievement	65	70	58	72	69	57	67	62	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	50	67	63		65	61	62	64	59

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	67%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	607
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
67%	72%	60%	68%	54%		42%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	72%	No		
English Language Learners	50%	No		
Black/African American Students	64%	No		
Hispanic Students	71%	No		
White Students	83%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	67%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	75%	73%	59%	79%	76%	73%	57%	65%					50%
Students With Disabilities	70%	64%	79%		70%	79%							
English Language Learners													50%
Black/African American Students	68%	65%	58%	80%	72%	71%	50%	44%					
Hispanic Students	80%		58%		85%	83%							50%
White Students	83%				83%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	76%	72%	58%	73%	74%	69%	45%	69%					

Page 15 of 38

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	61%			64%			67%					62%
Students With Disabilities	50%				63%								
English Language Learners	55%				82%								50%
Black/African American Students	54%	60%			52%			56%					
Hispanic Students	58%				79%								45%
White Students	60%				80%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	58%	62%			65%			61%					50%

E. 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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	72%	65%	7%	57%	15%
ELA	4	96%	62%	34%	56%	40%
ELA	5	65%	61%	4%	56%	9%
Math	3	59%	68%	-9%	63%	-4%
Math	4	91%	68%	23%	62%	29%
Math	5	78%	65%	13%	57%	21%
Science	5	65%	67%	-2%	55%	10%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was overall proficiency in ELA for both K-2nd and 3rd - 5th and Math for grades 3rd-5th.

The actions we took in these two areas were:

- Teachers and administration participated in ongoing PD and coaching aligned with the UF Flamingo Literacy instructional model and the science of reading models.
- Teachers conducted explicit small group instruction daily using the Flamingo literacy model.
- Teachers and administrators participated in ongoing PD that was specific to teaching systematic explicit strategies for increasing mathematical fluency led by our Math Coach.
- Teachers and administrators participated in ongoing PD that was specific to teaching systematic explicit strategies for increasing proficiency in the place value benchmarks led by our Math Coach.
- Implemented the Reveal Diagnostic Assessment at each grade level to determine prior knowledge.

Lowest Performance

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

Our lowest performance areas were in overall learning gains in ELA at 60% this year and 65% last year and in L25 Math gains at 57% this year and 82% last year. Student behaviors and ramped up for the second semester in 5th grade this year. We did spend more time in SEL activities than was required with the previous group of 5th graders.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline was the L25 Math at 57% this year and 82% the prior year. Our L25 4th graders outperformed our L25 5th graders. Student behaviors ramped up significantly for the second semester in 5th grade this year. Many of who were our most struggling math scholars. We did spend more time in SEL activities than was required with the previous group of 5th graders.

Greatest Gap

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.

We exceeded the state in all areas except 1st and 3rd grade math with our greatest gap being the 1st grade math (-13%). Although 3rd grade math was 3% below the state the cohort of students grew significantly from the prior year.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

90% or greater of Average daily attendance is an area of concern for us.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Teacher Clarity of standards-based learning 2. Explicit and systematic Writing instruction across all content areas and grade levels 3. Cognitive Engagement across all content areas by connecting background or prior knowledge to current learning

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Deepen understanding of the Florida's BEST ELA, Math, and Science standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Teacher clarity assures daily learning targets are explicit with evidence of student outcome to match the integrity of the benchmark. In order for teachers to ensure clarity, they must know the full the depth of the benchmark so feedback to students is effective, in order for complexity to increase.

Cognitive engagement with content requires students to engage at a higher level with the content. It requires students to use prior/background knowledge and connect it to knew content in order to synthesize information beyond "right there" thinking.

Writing to learn allows students to deepen their understanding of learning by reflecting and reasoning through oral and written language, thus taking it to long-term memory.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

24-25 Outcomes:

ELA Proficiency: 3rd - 5th grade 75%, K-2 72%

Math Proficiency: 3rd - 5th grade 76%, K-2 56%

Science Proficiency: 65%

By the end of the 25-26 school year, we will increase proficiency in all subject areas by at least 10%, as measured by FAST Reading and Math, and the State Science Assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach

the desired outcome.

This goal will be monitored by administration attending all PD with the teachers, and by using OPM data, fidelity check data, and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Garyn Boyd, Principal and Ste'Phan Lane, Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Our teachers will deepen understanding of the Florida's BEST ELA, Math, and Science standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. They will do so by improving their skills in the areas of: *Teacher Clarity *Cognitive engagement with content *Writing to learn

Rationale:

Teacher clarity assures daily learning targets are explicit with evidence of student outcome to match the integrity of the benchmark. In order for teachers to ensure clarity, they must know the full the depth of the benchmark so feedback to students is effective, in order for complexity to increase. Cognitive engagement with content requires students to engage at a higher level with the content. It requires students to use prior/background knowledge and connect it to knew content in order to synthesize information beyond "right there" thinking. Writing to learn allows students to deepen their understanding of learning by reflecting and reasoning through oral and written language, thus taking it to long-term memory.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Teacher Clarity

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd and Ste'Phan Lane

By When/Frequency:

May, 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Grade level teams will use the B.E.S.T. ELA, Math, and Science Standards and ALD's, PCS Gold and Pink Documents, when backwards plan their lessons for ELA, Math, and Science instruction in order to grow in the area of teacher clarity. This will be monitored by Administration and content coaches during grade level collaborative planning.

Action Step #2

Cognitive engagement with content

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd and Ste'Phan Lane

By When/Frequency:

By May, 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Grade level teams will use district PCS Modules / Units curriculum to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building (including connecting prior knowledge), and tasks (thematic projects) aligned to the rigor of the standards / benchmark. This will be monitored by Administration and content coaches during grade level collaborative planning.

Action Step #3

Writing to Learn

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd and Ste'Phan Lane

By When/Frequency:

By May, 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will integrate opportunities for students to write responses to reading and thinking in ELA, Math, and Science, that explicitly connects the content of the text / activity to specific Florida BEST ELA, Math, and Science Benchmarks. This will be monitored by Administration and content coaches during grade level collaborative planning.

Action Step #4

Year Long Professional Development on Writing to Learn and Knowledge Building

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd and Ste'Phan Lane

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

We will incorporate writing to learn in all PD experience across subjects so that teachers see the cognitive benefits to writing across all subjects. Writing 2.0 and article studies

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The rationale for this focus area is that 32% of our African American scholars have not yet reached proficiency on their grade level FAST Reading Assessment. Research shows that good readers are not always good writers, but good writers are always good readers.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We will increase proficiency from 68% to 80% on the 25-26 PM 3 Reading FAST Assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored during collaborative planning in the form of discussion and looking at student work. It will also be monitored when administrators and coaches do ongoing walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Stephan Lane, Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Oral Rehearsing Before Writing- Explicitly teach the difference between everyday language and written language, then provide opportunities to build fluency and stamina in writing through oral rehearsal.

Rationale:

Many students write the way they speak, not understanding that there is a difference between oral and written etiquette in the English language. Therefore, we need to explicitly teach the difference and then provide opportunities to build fluency and stamina in writing.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Content coaches and administration will explicitly teach / model oral rehearsing before writing.

Person Monitoring:

Annie Zuercher, PELI Coach

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Leadership will explicitly model how to write using the gradual release method, by first using oral

rehearsal at the sentence level before moving to the paragraph level. 2. Teachers will explicitly model how to write using the gradual release method, by first using oral rehearsal at the sentence level before moving to the paragraph level.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

No Answer Entered

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

We will increase proficiency in K-2 from 66% to 80% on the 25-26 PM 3 Reading FAST Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

School Literacy Leadership teams support the full implementation of the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative in grades VPK-2 by participating in PELI PD, debriefing and planning with the PELI coach weekly, by participating in collaborative planning for small group Flamingo instruction, and by conducting walk throughs with the PELI coach and PELI supervisor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Garyn Boyd, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Description of Intervention #1: Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

Rationale:

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. PD will be scheduled and implemented with administration and other members of the Literacy Leadership Team in attendance.

Action Step #2

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

3rd Grade Reading fluency—defined as the ability to read with speed, accuracy, and proper expression—is a critical bridge between decoding and comprehension. In third grade, fluency allows students to focus their cognitive energy on understanding the text rather than decoding individual words. Achieving fluency benchmarks appropriate for this grade level supports increased comprehension, academic confidence, and success across content areas, including science and social studies

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

24-25 Outcomes:

3rd Grade ELA Proficiency: 73%

Goal:

By the end of the 25-26 school year, we will increase proficiency on the 3rd grade FAST ELA Assessment, from 73% to at least 80%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We Will use regular progress monitoring

- Frequency: Every 1–2 weeks
- Tool: Use curriculum-based measurement (CBM) passages from tools like:
 - DIBELS
 - Read Naturally
- Track:
 - WCPM growth
 - Error patterns (e.g., substitutions, omissions)

3. Record and Graph Progress

- Use a fluency graph (WCPM vs. time) to track growth visually.

- Add a goal line based on national fluency norms (110 WCPM for mid-year 3rd grade).
- Review data regularly (every 4–6 weeks) to adjust instruction or intervention intensity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Garyn Boyd

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Repeated Reading- 1. Students read the same passage multiple times until they reach a target level of fluency. 2. Teacher models fluent reading, then students read in unison (choral) or repeat line-by-line (echo), providing real-time exposure to prosody, pacing, and expression. 3. Plot each student's WCPM on a line graph over time. Add a goal line based on grade-level norms

Rationale:

Reading fluency structures build automaticity, increases WCPM, and supports comprehension. It is effective for students below benchmark in fluency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Times Repeated Reading

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd

By When/Frequency:

Weekly / Bi-weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Repeated Reading- 1. Students read the same passage multiple times until they reach a target level of fluency. 2. Teacher models fluent reading, then students read in unison (choral) or repeat line-by-line (echo) 3. Plot each student's WCPM on a line graph over time 4. Monitor every 1–2 weeks 5. Record and Graph Progress 6. Review data regularly (every 4–6 weeks) to adjust instruction or intervention intensity

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

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

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We intend to decrease the number of scholars who have less than 90% average daily attendance from 24% to 14% for the 25-26 school year.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Research shows that student perform better and are more likely to success when they are in school. 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 and Angela Mayfield

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

We will implement Tier2 strategies at all grade levels to increase the number of students who have 90% or more average daily attendance.

Rationale:

Research shows that providing students with a voice and choice motivates them to want to be in school and it helps create a sense of belonging and community.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Increase student driven experiences to increase attendance.

Person Monitoring:

Garyn Boyd

By When/Frequency:

By May, 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Students will participate in an interest survey at the beginning of the school year. 2. Student interest data will be used to develop Tier 1 student experiences. 3. CST will disaggregate attendance data and share it with SBLT monthly. 4. SBLT will develop attendance graphs for each grade level to post.

Area of Focus #2**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:**Rationale:****Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

Kings Highway integrates the sharing of information and progress in the following ways:

- State of the Schools
- Newsletters (In English and Spanish)
- Social Media Posts
- Parent Station
- School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings
- Missed Meeting Notifications (Including Progress Data) (In English and Spanish)
- Student Led Conferences at target grade levels
- Parent events like Bring Dad to School Day, Bring Grandparents to School Day, Bring Mom to School Day, 3 STEAM Family Events

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Kings Highway plans to build and foster positive relationships with families by implementing processes that help parents have a better understanding of what is expected for their scholar in regard to grade level standards and assessments. Our Title 1 compact is a supporting document that

we use with parents throughout the school year. Additional ways that we foster relationships with our families are:

- Student grades progress reports sent bi-weekly by administration in grades 2nd - 5th
- Student Led Conferences at targeted grade levels, where data is the number one focus
- Parent events like Bring Dad to School Day, Bring Grandparents to School Day, Bring Mom to School Day, 3 STEAM Family Events
- 3rd Grade Parent Informational Meetings
- Weekly newsletter where parents can find what each grade level is learning for the month, student award recipients, ways to help at home, and pictures of all the amazing learning activities taking place at KHEMS

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

Kings Highway Elementary 25-26 Action steps to strengthen the academic program are:

- **Teacher clarity** of standards-based learning
- **Explicit and systematic Writing** instruction across all content areas and grade levels
- **Cognitive Engagement** across all content areas by connecting background or prior knowledge to current learning

Kings Highway Elementary implements a schoolwide Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to proactively address academic and behavioral challenges. This model ensures all students receive appropriate support in a timely and equitable manner.

- **Tiered Behavior Interventions:** Our school uses a PBIS framework supported by a schoolwide expectations matrix (SOAR: Safe, On-task, Accountable, Respectful). Positive behavior is reinforced daily through Lion Bucks and schoolwide celebrations.
- **Curriculum Coach:** This role is integral in the planning and implementation of Core standards at every grade level. They facilitate data-driven collaborative planning for both Tier 1 and Tier 2, guide intervention planning, and provide coaching to teachers in Core instruction, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction.
- **Data-Driven Decision Making:** We monitor early warning indicators and behavioral trends using data dashboards and behavior tracking systems. The MTSS team meets weekly to analyze this data and adjust interventions accordingly.

- **IDEA Alignment:** All behavior interventions are coordinated with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 Plans as applicable. Collaboration between general education teachers, ESE staff, and support personnel ensures compliance with IDEA and a seamless service continuum.
- **Parent Involvement:** Families are engaged throughout the MTSS process, including phone calls, conferences, and shared academic and behavior plans. Communication is ongoing to support consistency between school and home environments.

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

The School Improvement Plan is developed in collaboration with stakeholders and aligned with other federal, state, and local services. At Kings Highway Elementary, we coordinate with:

- **Federal Programs:** Title I funds support full-day programming for PreK-3 students.
- **Student Services and Mental Health Programs:** We partner with the district's student services team, school counselors, and community mental health agencies to address student well-being.
- **Community Partners:** Organizations like the City of Clearwater and other local partners support our scholars with back-to-school supplies and snack packs for the weekends.
- **Violence Prevention and PBIS:** Our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) systems are aligned with schoolwide expectations and supported by behavior assemblies and restorative practices.
- **Nutrition Programs:** We coordinate with the district's Food and Nutrition Department to ensure all students receive breakfast and lunch at no cost.
- **Career Readiness and College Awareness:** Our community outreach prepare students early for college and career readiness.

Kings Highway Elementary is proud to house a full-day PreK-3 program, supported by Title I and early childhood funds, to provide a strong two-year foundation for school readiness.

- **Full-Day 3-Year-Old Program:** Our early childhood program offers developmentally appropriate instruction, integrated play, and social-emotional learning to prepare students for Kindergarten.
- **Smooth Transitions:** The continuity between our PreK-3 and Kindergarten programs helps students and families build familiarity with school staff, routines, and expectations. This

seamless transition supports a confident start to formal schooling.

- **Family Engagement:** Parents of PreK students are invited to participate in orientation events, readiness workshops, and transition meetings. We provide families with resources and strategies to reinforce early learning at home.
- **Collaboration with Kindergarten Teachers:** PreK and Kindergarten teachers meet to align curriculum, share student data, and plan transition activities. This collaboration ensures academic and behavioral expectations are clearly communicated and developmentally appropriate.
- **Kindergarten Round-Up and Tours:** Families of rising Kindergarten students are welcomed to tour classrooms, meet teachers, and participate in hands-on learning sessions. Materials are provided in multiple languages to ensure accessibility.

These practices foster a strong school-home connection and ensure our youngest learners are equipped for long-term success.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	No
--	----

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00