Sky Academy Englewood School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

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.

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, 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
Bailey, John	Principal	
Jaques, Liz	Teacher, K-12	ELA teacher and department head.
Hicks, Stefani	School Counselor	School counselor and ESOL liaison.
Coatney, Megan	Reading Coach	Intensive reading teacher and testing coordinator.
Staley, Sabrina	Instructional Coach	math teacher and instructional coach.

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.

The SIP was developed by school staff examining data and speaking with stakeholders from the school and community. The SIP was then presented to the SKY Board for review and approval.

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

The SIP will be incorporated into each teacher individual professional development plan for the upcoming school year. This plan is reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure that the goals are being met and the staff member is on the right track. Based on reviews the teachers plans and SIP may be revised if the data warrants changes.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	6%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
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) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	40	32	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	21	30
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	13	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	10	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 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	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	43	85

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	30	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	14	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	12	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	96	89	245

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	30	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	14	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	12	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	96	89	245

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	

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*	62	57	49	55	57	50	58		
ELA Learning Gains				49			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			31		
Math Achievement*	62	64	56	65	38	36	70		
Math Learning Gains				58			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			55		
Science Achievement*	61	56	49	48	64	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	81	68	89	60	58	75		
Middle School Acceleration	73	73	73	67	51	49	55		
Graduation Rate					55	49			
College and Career Acceleration					83	70			
ELP Progress		57	40		76	76			

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	54			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	57			

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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	47			

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%
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	53			

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	62			62			61	87	73			
SWD	37			29							2	
ELL	53			57							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			56			50	64			4	
MUL	57			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			63			64	93	76		5	
FRL	57			57							2	

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	55	49	38	65	58	44	48	89	67			
SWD	33	36	14	32	39	27						
ELL	36	31		42	67							
AMI												
ASN												

| 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
BLK												
HSP	49	47	30	51	47	55						
MUL	38	64		60	67							
PAC												
WHT	58	49	41	69	61	41	48	88	63			
FRL	56	56		63	38							

| 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	58	52	31	70	53	55	46	75	55			
SWD	11	28	21	26	52	50	0	25				
ELL				50	10							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	51	41	31	59	45	31	50	92				
MUL	54	42		75	36							
PAC												
WHT	59	54	26	71	56	63	42	71	55			
FRL												

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
07	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	47%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	47%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	47%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	67%	1%	48%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	65%	23%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	79%	8%	66%	21%

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.

The SWD category in both ELA and Math were the lowest performing group, although they did show growth from the previous year. Students are continuing to fully return from the years disrupted by COVID. We saw increases in their scores, but the numbers are still lower than expected.

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

The percent of out of school suspensions increased from 9.1% to 20.7%. Some factors explaining this are new state guidelines on how some behaviors are categorized, which then results in different disciplinary actions.

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.

Our economically disadvantaged population in ELA has a large gap in the number of students achieving a level 5 on their achievement level. The states average was 5.1%, while SKY Academy Englewood has an achievement level of 22.2%. This is due to the intensive reading program that focuses on reading strategies and help fill in gaps and increases achievement.

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

There was a tremendous jump in achievement in social studies. The previous year we had a 16.9% level 5 achievement, and this year the score was 46.8%. At the same time our level one dropped from 8.4% to 4.8%. The primary factor in this was the change in school personnel.

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

Students with disabilities and students in the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math.

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

Increase SWD achievement in ELA and Math
Increase the lowest 25% in Math and ELA.
Continue to grow and improve the science department, resulting in improved 8th grade science scores.
Improve student attendance and reduce the number of chronic students who are absent.
Reduce the number of out of school suspensions.

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

#1. 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.

Students with disabilities in both math and ela need to be addressed and steps taken to improve their achievement level.

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

The goal for the upcoming school year is for the SWD population to improve their achievement level to a minimum of 40%.

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

This will be monitored through the teacher's individual improvement plan and quarterly meetings with each individual teacher. Weekly grade level and team meetings will also take place in which student data will be discussed and interventions planned.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Bailey (john.bailey@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Use of an Intensive ELA Class to support additional instruction for low performing SWD. Progress monitoring will be completed on a quarterly basis through the use of i-ready.

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

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. Identify SWD with low performing scores
2. Review reporting categories for gaps in learning
3. Schedule students for daily intensive ELA class\
4. Progress monitor using I-ready
5. Develop an individualized learning plan to support individual students according to their unique gaps.

Person Responsible: John Bailey (john.bailey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: end of quarter 1

#2. 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.

Attendance for all students is critical to student success in school.

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

SKY Academy Englewood will maintain the number of students who have less than 90% attendance rates.

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

Daily attendance reports will be run by the front desk attendance secretary and phone calls will be made home to students exhibiting attendance concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Bailey (john.bailey@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Implement a monitoring program through the homeroom teachers.

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

Students who have adults on the campus who care for them and monitor their attendance are more likely to be addressed as the attendance issues arise.

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. Monitor attendance rate on a bi-weekly basis via homeroom teachers
2. Mail home attendance notices for students accruing excessive absences
3. Parent contact/conference for students accruing more than 10 absences in a term
4. Student referrals to School Wide Support Team (SWST) to establish an action plan for student
5. Progress monitor action plan with updated parent contact as needed

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: end of quarter 1

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile group in mathematics in grades 6-8

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

Sky Academy Englewood will increase the percentage of lowest quartile students who make learning gains on the end of year assessments in Mathematics from 44% to 50%.

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

Weekly team meetings and department meetings in which student data will be examined.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Bailey (john.bailey@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Progress Learning and I-Ready diagnostic, progress monitoring and intervention

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

Students will utilize the iready and progress learning programs for diagnostic and intervention purposes. Program will identify areas of weaknesses and target instructional pathways along the different reporting categories.

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. Students take i-ready and progress learning 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 and progress learning will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth
6. Student pathway is redefined at each window.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: end of quarter 1

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).

Funding allocations will be examined by the school leadership team after data has been examined from the team and department leaders. The school leadership team will make recommendations on how funding should be used and whether it is properly being allocated to the correct program. The schools governing board will also be involved in final decisions about funding allocation.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0117 - Sky Academy Englewood	General Fund		$5,000.00
			Notes: Funding to help support our PBIS program which encourages attendance.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$8,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0117 - Sky Academy Englewood	General Fund		$8,800.00
			Notes: Progress Learning program for students.			
					Total:	$13,800.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes