

Sarasota County Schools

Sky Academy Englewood



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

Demographics

Principal: John Bailey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	6%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

SKY Academy's mission is to promote student achievement through an infusion of rigorous academic, wellness and fitness strategies incorporated into the learning and mastery of the Florida State Standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sky Academy's vision is to develop a Middle School that is highly regarded for its academic excellence, through the building of strong bodies and in developing an understanding of the importance of wellness and nutrition for academic success.

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
Bailey, John	Principal	Daily operations of the school.
Jaques, Liz	Teacher, K-12	6th grade ELA teacher and department head
Shea, Natalia	Assistant Principal	Assists in the day-to-day operations of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, John Bailey

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

320

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

5

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

6

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	113	103	0	0	0	0	325	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	30	0	0	0	0	69	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	14	0	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	12	0	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	60	96	89	0	0	0	0	245	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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 10/27/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	91	76	0	0	0	0	259	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	12	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	13	0	0	0	0	38	
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	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	91	76	0	0	0	0	259	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	12	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	13	0	0	0	0	38	
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	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	55%	57%	50%				61%	64%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						51%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						50%	50%	47%
Math Achievement	65%	38%	36%				73%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	58%						63%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						58%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	64%	53%				51%	61%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	60%	58%				83%	85%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2022					
	2019	62%	66%	-4%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	58%	73%	-15%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2022					
	2019	88%	65%	23%	46%	42%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	48%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	85%	-3%	71%	11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	33	36	14	32	39	27					
ELL	36	31		42	67						
HSP	49	47	30	51	47	55					
MUL	38	64		60	67						
WHT	58	49	41	69	61	41	48	88	63		
FRL	56	56		63	38						
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	11	28	21	26	52	50		25			
ELL				50	10						
HSP	51	41	31	59	45	31	50	92			
MUL	54	42		75	36						
WHT	59	54	26	71	56	63	42	71	55		
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	23	41	40	38	47	53					
HSP	69	46		62	48						
WHT	61	52	51	75	65	62	53	83	84		
FRL	56	51	52	57	47	27					

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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	53
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?

Math and reading learning gains across all groups did not grow as they did in previous years.

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

SWD and the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math learning gains.

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

The school has a large turnover of staff coming out of the COVID year. This contributed to a decrease in teaching experience in the core academic subjects. Retaining teachers and developing a new intensive math program should help improve learning gains across all groups.

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

Civics and Science saw growth, with Civics making the largest increase.

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

New civics teacher with a stronger focus on instructional delivery. For science, the teacher has now taught the subject for three years and is more familiar with the material.

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

Students who scored a three or higher in 7th-grade math will be placed in Algebra 1. Intensive math and reading classes will help develop skills for those students struggling in these areas.

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.

Professional Development in the new math curriculum and PD in the new progress monitoring program.

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

Development of a new intensive math program in which students who scored a level 1 in math are required to take the intensive math class. The goal is to develop math skills and help the students progress toward grade level.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students from the school year 2022 in the lowest 25% had a proficiency rate of 38% in ELA. This represented a slight increase from 31% from the previous years state assessment scores, but not at the level expected.

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

SKY Academy Englewood's lowest 25% will increase their proficiency rate on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T) in ELA from 38% to 45%.

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

Monitored through PM1 and PM2 as well as using progress learning platform.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

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

Use of an Intensive ELA Class to support additional instruction for low-performing students. Progress monitoring will be completed every quarter through the use of progress learning.

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

Students who are not performing at a proficient level on state assessments need additional time to address gaps in learning as well as support in on grade level instruction.

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.

1. Review reporting categories for gaps in learning
2. Schedule students for daily intensive ELA class.
3. Progress monitor using I-ready and progress learning as well as PM1 and PM2
4. Develop an individualized learning plan to support individual students according to their unique gaps.

Person Responsible

Liz Jaques (elizabeth.jaques@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

Improving the learning gains for the lowest quartile students is vital to the success of the student and the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SKY Academy Englewood's lowest 25% will increase learning gains in math on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T) from 44% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and administrators will monitor I-Ready diagnostic results, the progress learning platform, PM1 and PM2, and classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

I-Ready diagnostic, progress monitoring and intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will utilize the IXL programs for diagnostic and intervention purposes. The program will identify areas of weakness and target instructional pathways along the different reporting categories.

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.

1. Students take i-ready diagnostics
2. Students conference with their teachers and set goals
3. A learning pathway is developed for each student to address gaps in learning
4. Teacher monitors progress on a bi-weekly basis
5. Follow up progress monitoring through i-ready will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth
6. Student pathway is redefined at each window.

Person Responsible

Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

#3. 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.

Improving the proficiency rate for SWD is vital to the success of the student and the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SKY Academy Englewood SWD will increase their proficiency rate in ELA from the beginning of the year PM1 to PM 3 by five percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place through I-Ready diagnostics and routine classroom observations and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Use of an Intensive ELA Class to support additional instruction for low-performing students. Progress monitoring will be completed every quarter through the use of i-ready.

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

Students who are not performing at a proficient level on state assessments need additional time to address gaps in learning and support in ongrade-level instruction.

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.

1. Review reporting categories for gaps in learning
2. Schedule students for daily intensive ELA class.
3. Progress monitoring using I-ready and progress learning.
4. Develop an individualized learning plan to support individual students according to their unique gaps.

Person Responsible

Liz Jaques (elizabeth.jaques@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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.

SKY has developed a PBIS program focused around the positive actions of the students in our school. This incentive program will recognize student for exhibiting qualities within the seven wellnesses. Instruction on the meanings behind the wellnesses and how they impact our daily lives occurs within homeroom settings on a weekly basis.

Homeroom time built into the schedule to address SEL curriculum needs and aligned to SKY Academy's 7 wellnesses: Social, Occupational, Spiritual, Physical, Intellectual, Emotional and Environmental.

Guidance is in its fourth year on the campus to address student needs as individuals.

Anonymous reporting apps (Fortify Florida) have added to the school for students to report incidents of bullying, social concerns, safety and threats. Teambuilding and collective collaboration activities are implemented in instruction when appropriate. New groups / Lunch Bunches are held with groups of students focused on specific topics (grief, social skills, communication, etc).

Aftercare program developed to include more interactive opportunities for students to socialize appropriately through games and activities.

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

The school has developed a PBIS committee which is responsible for planning, administering, and analyzing the PBIS program. We will collect data and track student behavior and create a plan for rewarding positive student choices. The PBIS committee is comprised of the ESE liaison, school counselor, subject matter classroom teachers, and administrators. The PBIS committee meets on a monthly basis.