Skyline Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Skyline Elementary School

620 SW 19TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://sky.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will inspire each other to be leaders with our awesome attitudes and exceptional behaviors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's Learners, Tomorrow's Leaders

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Trombetti, Laura	Principal	Provide instructional leadership at the assigned school that will ensure continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provide organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high performance expectations for all stakeholders.
Schmitt, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Ms. Schmitt processes referrals and works collaboratively with teachers to proactively prevent behavior in the classroom to decrease referrals. She is in charge of our PBIS team which worked to create a common language on campus and holds monthly meetings to improve behavior.
Fenske, Renee	Other	Provide assistance and ongoing professional development to teachers, including training, coaching, and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies, and best practices to generate improvement in reading/literacy instruction and student achievement.
Taveras, Jhonathan	Instructional Technology	Facilitate and support the integration of technology and assistive technology into the classroom and home to support effective instruction and learning
Skocik, Amanda	Reading Coach	Mrs. Skocik is the primary specialist. She is in charge of K-2 PLCs and collaborates with teachers to plan interventions in the classroom and analyze data to monitor effectiveness.

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

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

Since the SIP is a fluid document, stakeholders are included in the review and edit of the SIP throughout the school year. Mission and vision statements as well as goals are reviewed quarterly with School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Organization.

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

Quarterly data chats during Professional Learning Team meetings to review state progress monitoring and mastering of state standards. Students' data is individually tracked and monitored for appropriate intervention. Once data is analyzed, adjustments to instruction and interventions are made.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C

	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	71	56	54	57	58	51	0	0	0	347
One or more suspensions	3	7	5	10	3	12	0	0	0	40
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	25	29	17	7	3	3	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	9	7	14	3	3	14	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	36	46	27	51	37	44	0	0	0	241
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	14	9	16	34	43	56	0	0	0	172
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	26	26	16	18	0	0	0	100

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	5	7	5	22	37	50	0	0	0	126

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	40	41	43	41	43	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	8	6	10	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	1	14	16	17	5	5	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	7	4	7	3	4	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	26	37	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	20	41	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	65	87	84	24	27	42	0	0	0	329

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	3	16	14	30	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	12

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	40	41	43	41	43	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	8	6	10	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	1	14	16	17	5	5	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	7	4	7	3	4	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	26	37	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	20	41	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	65	87	84	24	27	42	0	0	0	329

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	3	16	14	30	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	12

(Grade Level columns: K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8)

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	48	53	53	52	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				52			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			47		
Math Achievement*	57	57	59	62	45	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				63			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			35		
Science Achievement*	48	53	54	57	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	66	51	59	67			63		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	51			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	58			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	51			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	51			57			48					66
SWD	33			34			33				5	50
ELL	37			59			35				5	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			54			60				4	
HSP	45			55			43				5	63
MUL	43			57							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			58			52				4	
FRL	46			53			48				5	67

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	53	52	47	62	63	51	57					67
SWD	20	20	20	25	43	52	22					47
ELL	34	58	71	52	53	50	47					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	60		53	58							
HSP	47	50	47	55	54	39	53					65
MUL	54	53		62	85		50					
PAC												
WHT	58	52	52	69	68	55	63					
FRL	46	47	39	54	58	47	49					69

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	56	53	47	52	49	35	48					63
SWD	28	41	33	26	32	38	17					44
ELL	34	48	54	36	42	38	28					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			48								
HSP	51	52	48	46	48	35	38					62
MUL	52			48								
PAC												
WHT	62	48		59	55		60					
FRL	48	52	58	44	39	21	44					64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	42%	9%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	51%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA proficiency for grade 2 is 54%.
ELA proficiency for grade 3 is 51%.
ELA proficiency for grade 5 is 53%.
ELA state goal is 59% by 2024.
Fifth grade science percentage of proficient students decreased from 59% to 47%. The contributing factor for this decrease is the addition of a teacher to the fifth grade team for the 22-23 school year who was ineffective in teaching Math and Science. This teacher was released in January and an intern took the position.
Science state goal is 57% by 2024.

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

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are Integration of Knowledge and background knowledge.

Fifth grade science percentage of proficient students decreased from 59% to 47%.
The contributing factor for this decrease was the addition of a teacher to the fifth grade team for school year 22-23 who was ineffective in teaching Math and Science. This teacher was released in January and an intern took the position.
The action steps that are implemented for the 23-24 school year:
The purpose for these steps is to increase student achievement in Science to 60% by the 23-24 state assessment.
Hire highly qualified teachers to instruct math and science.
Consistency in science plans to align to district curriculum and instructional guides will be overseen by admin by
unit and observed at PLT meeting.
Data analyzes on student achievement through progress monitoring through out the year.
Scheduled quarterly curriculum meetings to review instructional practices, pacing and materials with district
science coordinator.

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.

Students' limited and/or different background knowledge and limited resources for teachers to use for Integration of knowledge are contributing factors for the need for improvement In the future to improve, we will devote time at PLCs to share best practices/resources and reach out to our Leading and Learning team members.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were I-Ready reading supports, WIN time intervention implemented at all grade levels. Common planning time to allow for collaboration/sharing best practices. Leading and Learning Representatives at each grade level to share high yield strategies and curriculum/instruction best practices. I-Ready and IXL trainings to help with interpreting the data and making planning decisions. Co-taught classrooms with paraprofessional for additional support. Tutoring offered to the L25 students. Daily grade level intervention with ESSA and ESOL students with research based supplemental materials.

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

1. Student attendance- 1/3 of our school population missed 10% or more days
2. Student suspension- 40 students were suspended from school for 1 or more days.

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

1. Academic Rigor in student work and centers
2. Planned and purposeful questioning and practice during instruction
3. Grade level intervention tracking on Reading Components: Phonics, Phonological Awareness, Fluency,
Decoding, Vocabulary, Comprehension (Fiction and Informational)

4. Retain highly qualified and highly effective teachers
5. Student attendance and tardies.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

School grade components in alignment with Envision 2030 and K-5 i-Ready.
Second Grade ELA Proficiency 22-23 proficient students were 54%
Third Grade ELA Proficiency 22-23 proficient students were 51%
Third-Fifth Grade ELA Proficiency 22-23 proficient students were 53%

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

Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in 2nd grade from 54% to 58% as measured by the STAR Reading Enterprise Assessment.
Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in 3rd grade from 51% to 55% as measured by the FY24 ELA FAST.
Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in 3rd- 5th grade from 53% to 57% as measured by the FY24 ELA FAST.

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

2nd grade Data will be collected through quarterly progress monitoring cycle and district standards based exemplars, DIBELS, which included analysis instruments such as iReady and STAR Reading Enterprise Assessments.
3rd -5th Data will be collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle and district standards based exemplars, which included instruments such as iReady and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

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

Skyline is moving towards a Competency -Based Instruction by using the New Art and Science of Teaching as our Instructional Model.
Students will have exposure to on-grade-level standards in Core I instruction by a highly qualified teacher with a reading endorsement.
High Yield Teaching Strategies are implemented and recorded in teacher lesson plans- they are discussed and reviewed at weekly grade level PLT meetings (every Wednesday).
Strategic classroom observations from administration to observe rigorous formative assessments and student work to compare with state item specs.
Analysis oiI-Ready Diagnostic, Exemplars, Quarterly Comprehensives, and FAST assessments to plan specific interventions/enrichment planned at weekly PLT meetings.
Interventions are individualized through i-Ready Diagnostic, Student Learning Paths, FAST assessments, formatives, and classroom performance.
WIN Time is scheduled so that interventions/enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all personnel resources.
SWD are served in co-taught classrooms with an ESE resource teacher and teacher assistants.
Teacher Assistants scheduled to provide support students in ESSA groups.
Progress monitoring is based on students' IEPs
Progress of SWD (ESSA subgroup) will be monitored through I-Ready, FAST assessments, formatives and instruction will be differentiated.

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

Students who are proficient in grade level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Data indicated that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. They plan will be monitored through the actions steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroup -Students with disabilities..

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Clear Purpose/Desired result: 2-5 grade ELA proficiency will increase from __52%__ to 57% for the FY24 school year as measured by the STAR Renaissance and FAST Assessments

Accountability/Measure the success of goal by the FY24 STAR and FAST assessments

System independency/Documentation:
Daily instructional schedule to allow for 90 minute uninterrupted reading block and 60 minute intervention and extension on reading skills.
Reading Endorsed Teachers
Primary Specialist to assist K-2 teachers with instructional coaching and curriculum expertise.
Weekly, PLT meetings have a set agenda and norms
Weekly, Lesson plans have have set criteria for student engagement and high yield strategies and follow district instructional guides
Common boards in every classroom have a set criteria to include objective/essential standard, essential question, academic vocabulary.
Classroom walk-throughs follow Danielson Instructional Practices Evaluation model.
Students given District Exemplars
2nd grade students assessed with DIBELS for Phonics and Decoding- results produce individualized intervention.
3rd-5th grade assessed with DIBELS for Phonics and Fluency deficiencies to produce individualized intervention.
Student data is uploaded in Performance Matters for standards tracking
Intervention groups made after exemplars to give intervention and extension for students.
Students are invited for after school tutoring, given additional supplemental programs on chromebooks, and offered schedule changes for additional reading intervention.
Individualizing instruction on the five components of Reading: Comprehension, Fluency, Vocabulary, Phonics, and Phonemic Awareness

Prevent an endless variety of interpretation/Repeatable:
Student data is visibly tracked on common PLT grade level board and on grade level google excel sheet.
FAST Progress monitoring and STAR data used to analyze student achievement and proficiency
Identifying level 1 students and which reading component intensive instruction is needed for intervention: Phonemic Awareness, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Phonics
Identifying level 2 students and which reading component intensive instruction is needed for intervention:

Phonemic Awareness, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Phonics

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: FY24 Q4 STAR Renaissance

Planning System:
What: 100% of teachers will use District Instructional Guides and Pacing Calendar which align with Florida Best Standards. In addition, 100% of the teachers will participate in the professional learning team meetings each Wednesday to analyze data, adjust intervention, individualize instruction.
How Often: Teachers will have weekly planning and weekly professional learning team meeting. Daily classroom walkthroughs to observe standards alignment with posted objectives, instruction, and student work.
Monitor: Administration and Leadership Team

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: on going for the FY24 school year

Core/Tier 1 System:
What: 2-5 students will have a 90 minute uninterrupted reading block on grade level. All teachers will use the LCSD Instructional and pacing guides, test item specifications, and planning slides provided by district. There will be a 60 minute intervention or extension block for all students. Students will participate in DIBELS Fluency Benchmarks, Exemplar Benchmarks, and Comprehensive Quarterly Checks to ensure standards mastery in Comprehension, Fluency, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness and Vocabulary.
How: The Master Schedule has been created to allow for reading and intervention/enrichment block. Enrichment includes the use of the BEST Literature and Writing Workshop Grades 2-5.
Monitor: Admin. will monitor and schedule walkthroughs during reading and intervention to monitor and offer coaching if needed. On grade level students will be tracked via google form on standards to ensure mastery and reviewed during PLT meetings after assessments have been given.

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: on-going for the FY24 school year.

Intervention/Extension System:
What: For students who meet or exceed Tier I/Core instruction, there will be 60 extension activities from the BEST Literature and Writing Workshop Grades 2-5
Grade 2- Intervention: Fly Leaf Reading Components
Extension: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop
Grades 3-5- Intervention: Phonics and Phonemic Awareness-Phonics For
Reading
Fluency-DIBELS
Vocab/Comprehension- Exemplars
Extension: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: FY24 Progress Monitoring #3

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready.

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

Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency from 31% to 37% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

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

Data will be collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as FAST assessments, iReady and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

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

More exposure to on-grade-level standards.
Curriculum Map/Instructional Guide Training
More rigorous formative assessments and centers.
Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed.
Data analysis and identification of struggling students to provide differentiation.
Continuation of Top Score and implementation in 2nd and 3rd grade.
Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions/enrichment
Interventions are individualized through I-Ready Diagnostic, Student Learning Paths, FAST assessments, formatives, and classroom performance.
WIN Time is scheduled at the same time throughout the grade-level so that interventions/enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.
High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings in PLCs.
Administrative classroom walkthroughs based on High Yield Strategies and Student Engagement
SWD are served in co-taught classrooms with an ESE resource teacher.
Paraprofessionals provide support within these classrooms
Progress monitoring is based on students' IEPs
Progress of SWD (ESSA subgroup) students will be monitored through I-Ready and formatives and instruction will be differentiated.

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

Students who are proficient in grade-level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Data indicates that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. The plan will be monitored through the action steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroup - ESE students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Weekly PLCS to review student error analysis and student work (academic coach, teachers)
2. Weekly PLC meeting notes (Primary Specialist/Dean)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic and FAST assessment data analysis (teachers, primary specialist/dean)
4. Progress monitoring with ESE resource teacher to differentiate (teachers, ESE resource teacher)
5. Classroom walkthroughs
6. Leadership Team Meetings
7. Quarterly meetings and frequent collaboration with district contacts to plan PLCs, analyze data, and individualized interventions (coordinator, coach, teachers)

Progress will be monitored in PLCs with teachers, coaches, and administrators. The leadership team will discuss this information to plan next steps. District level coaches will also be involved in the PLC process and assist in planning targeted interventions based on data.

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: FY24 Q4 FAST Assessment.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

School grade components in alignment with Envision 2030.

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

In FY23, Skyline Elementary's Science Achievement will increase from 57% to 60% as measured by the Florida DOE state measuring assessment in Spring of 2023.

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

Data will be collected through progress monitoring cycle using Performance Matters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

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

More exposure to on-grade-level standards.
Curriculum Map/Instructional Guide Reviews
More rigorous formative assessments and centers.
Data analysis and identification of struggling students to provide differentiation.
Interventions are individualized through Exemplars and classroom performance.
WIN Time is scheduled at the same time throughout the grade-level so that interventions/enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.
High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings in PLTs.
Administrative classroom walkthroughs based on High Yield Strategies and Student Engagement
SWD are served in co-taught classrooms with an ESE resource teacher.
Paraprofessionals provide support within these classrooms
Progress monitoring is based on students' IEPs
Progress of SWD (ESSA subgroup) will be monitored through I-Ready, FAST assessments, formatives and instruction will be differentiated.

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

Students who are proficient in grade level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Data indicated that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. They plan will be monitored through the actions steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroup.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Weekly PLTS to review student error analysis and student work (academic coach, teachers)
2. Weekly PLT meeting notes (Primary Specialist/Dean)
3. Exemplars and classroom performance data analysis
4. Progress monitoring with ESE resource teacher to differentiate (teachers, ESE resource teacher)
5. Classroom walkthroughs
6. Leadership Team Meetings to review data
7. PLC Planning with ESE Coordinator to plan PLT meetings and analyze data/needs (coordinator, coaches, teachers)

Progress will be monitored in PLTs with teachers, Leading and Learning Reps, and administrators. The leadership team will discuss this information to plan next steps. District level coaches will also be involved in the PLT process and assist in planning targeted interventions based on data.

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: FY24 Q4 Science Assessment.

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

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

One area of focus for Skyline's positive culture and environment is to improve student attendance.

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

For FY23 347 (33%) students missed more than 10% of the school year, for FY24 school year our percentage of students missing 10% or more days will decrease to 15%.

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

Weekly attendance reports
Bi-weekly attendance meeting with social worker, school counselor, ISS, and admin.
Use of attendance contracts with targeted students
Phone calls to parent of target students
Student check-ins by members of the attendance team
Attendance MTSS plans created

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

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

Schoolwide attendance expectations, recognitions and incentives
Class visuals that reflect the reason for good attendance
Student goals
Strategically place targeted students with highly motivated teachers
Encourage targeted students' involvement in afterschool clubs or have specials assignments
Match targeted students with mentor for a check in system

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

Attendance interventions for chronically absent students provide support and resources to address individual factors that contribute to absences such as low self-esteem, school anxiety, social skills, or medical conditions; familial factors such as discipline, parental support, or poverty.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly attendance reports
Bi-weekly attendance meeting with social worker, school counselor, ISS, and admin.

Use of attendance contracts with targeted students
Phone calls to parent of target students
Student check-ins by members of the attendance team
Attendance MTSS plans created

Person Responsible: Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

By When: On-going

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

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

*Common Board elements evident- Benchmark/Standard number, Benchmark Language or objective, annotated academic vocabulary

*Explicit instruction- modeling and demonstrating during instruction, use of visuals and examples, use of academic vocabulary
*Aligned benchmark student task- student rigor on student tasks aligned to benchmark expectations
*Teacher questions are aligned to benchmark expectations
*Collaborative structure of peer interaction processing, organized structures for student interaction, students engaged in cognitively complex tasks during collaboration.
These instructional practices will ensure student learning in literacy
2022 Data: students scoring below grade level on STAR EL/STAR/FAST
K-49%
1st-51%
2nd-45%
3rd-49%

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

*Common Board elements evident- Benchmark/Standard number, Benchmark Language or objective, annotated academic vocabulary
*Explicit instruction- modeling and demonstrating during instruction, use of visuals and examples, use of academic vocabulary
*Aligned benchmark student task- student rigor on student tasks aligned to benchmark expectations
*Teacher questions are aligned to benchmark expectations
*Collaborative structure of peer interaction processing, organized structures for student interaction, students engaged in cognitively complex tasks during collaboration.
These instructional practices will ensure student learning in literacy.
2022 Data: students scoring below grade level on FAST PM3
3rd-49%
4th- 44%
5th-43%

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

K- ELA: We will increase student achievement from 51% on the 2022 FAST STAR EL to 55% on the 2023 FAST STAR EL
1st- ELA: We will increase student achievement from 49% on the 2022 FAST STAR EL to 53% on the 2023 FAST STAR EL
2nd - ELA: In FY24, Skyline 's ELA Proficiency for grade 2 will increase from 55% (2022) to 58% as measured by the STAR Test.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd-ELA: In FY24, Skyline 's ELA Proficiency for grade 3 will increase from 51% (2022) to 55% as measured by FAST.

4th- ELA: *In FY24, Skyline 's ELA Proficiency for grade 4 will increase from PM1(FALL 2023) 25% to PM3 (SPRING 2023) 56 % as measured by FAST.
5th ELA: In FY24, Skyline 's ELA Proficiency for grade 5 will increase from PM1 (FALL 2023) 34% to PM3 (SPRiNG) 57% as measured by FAST.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administrative walkthroughs using Benchmark Alignment tool for evidence of research based instruction.
Monitor Intervention for program fidelity
Track the five components of reading through a digital benchmark tracking system
Collect student data from STAR, DIbels, Really Great Reading, Phonics Assessments, Quarterly Comprehensive Assessments and i-Ready.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Trombetti, Laura, lauraat@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

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

All ELA and intervention programs have been vetted for STRONG evidence-based for improving student outcomes-
State Adopted Wonders, Really Great Reading, District Exemplars, FlyLeaf Reading, BEST Literature, Phonics for Reading align with district K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
All programs align to the BEST ELA Standards

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

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

Students will be grouped according to their need in Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Comprehension, and Fluency
ESSA groups also use Imagine Learning, Mindplay (ESE)

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
1. Primary Specialist will work closely with K-2 teachers and monitor student data for successful implementation of Core Reading Program and Intervention Program. 2. Professional Development- The Science of Reading will be offered to all teachers to enhance their knowledge of reading instruction.	Trombetti, Laura, lauraat@leeschools.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes