Sky Academy Venice School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sky Academy Venice

701 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.skyatthey.com

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Sarasota County School Board on 8/14/2023.

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.

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
Warren, Ann	Principal	
Shaw, Mary	Assistant Principal	
Killeen, Sara	School Counselor	
Santowasso, Christina	Other	ESE Liaison
Novia, Robert	Teacher, K-12	8th grade Math teacher and department head.
King, Alyson	Teacher, K-12	6th grade ELA teacher and department head.

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 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's individual 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 in on the right path for meeting the goal. 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	14%
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)* 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: C 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	19	19	17	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	16	29
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	18	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	14	10	46
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	27	40	50	117

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	2	0	2
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	19	26	21	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	18	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	19	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	13	50
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	
	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	27	43	34	104

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	3	1	4
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	19	26	21	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	18	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	19	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	13	50
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	
	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	27	43	34	104

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	3	1	4
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*	53	57	49	49	57	50	51		
ELA Learning Gains				50			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			69		
Math Achievement*	54	64	56	45	38	36	54		
Math Learning Gains				37			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28			42		
Science Achievement*	35	56	49	40	64	53	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	81	68	73	60	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	64	73	73	49	51	49	56		
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	24	Yes	3	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	53			

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	22	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	49			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	53			54			35	73	64			
SWD	27			21							2	
ELL	31			54							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50			38			45	82	45		5	
MUL	62			62							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			56			33	73	66		5	
FRL	53			53							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	49	50	41	45	37	28	40	73	49			
SWD	14	32	31	6	15	15	10	50				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	46	50		47	43		33	75				
MUL	53	46		44	0							
PAC												
WHT	51	51	50	45	39	37	41	73	54			
FRL	45	45	38	27	34	29	13	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	51	59	69	54	45	42	60	74	56			
SWD	15	54	64	23	42	46						
ELL	67	67		42	42							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50	69		65	44							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	59	73	50	43	48	59	71	53			
FRL	58	80		50	50							

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	51%	55%	-4%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	47%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	44%	54%	-10%	47%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	67%	-5%	48%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	55%	-22%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	65%	6%	50%	21%

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	71%	79%	-8%	66%	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.

The SWD category in both ELA and Math were the lowest performing groups, 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.

Our greatest decline was in the areas of Level 1 Reading students. We went from 34 students scoring in the Level 1 range to 49 students. We believe the factors that contributed to these declines include an increase in SWD and ESOL students enrolling in our school. Also, our Intensive reading teacher missed three months of school due to FMLA.

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 greatest gap was in the area of 6th grade math. The state average of students scoring a 3 or higher on the 6th grade FAST was 49% while the school's was only 40%. This is due to the school's limited offerings of Intensive Math classes. This school year there will six additional Intensive Math classes offered for students scoring a Level 1 or Level 2 on the FAST Mathematics assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 6th grade ELA. This is due to offering smaller class sizes in Intensive Reading and adding an intervention specialist halfway through the school year. Teachers also offered after school remediation for targeted students.

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

The two areas of concern are students with disabilities and students scoring in the lowest quartile in ELA and Math. It is noted that some of these students fit both categories.

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

Increase SWD achievement in ELA and Math on the end of year assessment.
Increase the proficiency rates of the students scoring in the lowest quartile in ELA and Math on the end of year assessment.
Increase the proficiency rate of the students scoring in the lowest quartile in Science on the end of year assessment.
Improve student attendance and reduce the number of chronic students who are absent.

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 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.

Overall, students in the 8th grade are not showing the expected learning gains in science.

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

The percentage of students who are showing proficiency on the end-of-year 8th grade science assessment will increase from 33% to 43%.

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

Progress monitoring using Progress Learning and the Common Unit Assessments by science teachers for all 8th grade students. Data will be examined during weekly department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Warren (ann.warren@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, progress monitoring and intervention, Critical Thinking class for 30 minutes per day to focus on learning gaps.

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

Adding intervention time to students schedules will provide students with additional time to access previously taught skills in order to address gaps in learning.

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. Review students' Common Unit assessment scores.
2. Teacher will design lessons and classroom assessments using Progress Learning that focus on the skill sets that students are struggling the most with.
3. Teacher monitors progress.
4. Follow up progress monitoring through Progress Learning will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth.

Person Responsible: Ann Warren (ann.warren@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Students with disabilities are not performing at the same level as their peers in both ELA and Math.

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

SWD will increase their proficiency across the FAST assessment by 15% in reading and mathematics.

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

Progress monitoring using Progress Learning by core content teachers monthly for goal checks. Weekly grade level and team meetings will also take place in which student data (grades, PM1, PM2, PM3, etc.) will be discussed and interventions planned.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Warren (ann.warren@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.)

Small group instruction through push-in support by the ESE teacher into ELA and math classes. There will also be six Intensive ELA and six Intensive Math classes offered to support additional instruction for low performing SWD students.

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 require intensive instructional time to address gaps in learning, as well as additional 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 students with low performing scores in reading and mathematics.
2. School Leadership Team reviews schedules for all SWD with push-in or pull our services.
3. Schedule students for daily Intensive ELA and Math classes.
4. Develop a learning plan individualized to each student according to their unique learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Ann Warren (ann.warren@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

Students with multiple indicators and free and reduced lunch are not showing the expected learning gains in ELA across the grade levels.

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

The percentage of students with multiple indicators and free and reduced lunch will increase their proficiency across the FAST assessment by 15% in Reading

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

Progress monitoring using Progress Learning and the PM1/PM2 scores by ELA teachers for students who have multiple indicators and receive free and reduced lunch. Data will be examined during weekly department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Warren (ann.warren@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, progress monitoring and intervention, Critical Thinking class for 30 minutes per day to focus on learning gaps.

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

Adding intervention time to students schedules through the Critical Thinking class will provide students with additional time to access previously taught skills in order to address gaps in learning.

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. Review students' PM1, PM2, and PM3 scores.
2. Students will take Progress Learning diagnostics.
3. A learning pathway will be developed for each student to address learning gaps.
4. Teacher monitors progress.
5. Follow up progress monitoring through Progress Learning will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth.
6. Student pathway will be redefined as needed.

Person Responsible: Ann Warren (ann.warren@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

Students with multiple indicators and free and reduced lunch are not showing the expected learning gains in Math across the grade levels.

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

The percentage of students with multiple indicators and free and reduced lunch will increase their proficiency on the FAST assessment by 15% in Mathematics.

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

Progress monitoring using Progress Learning and the PM1/PM2 scores by math teachers for students who have multiple indicators and receive free and reduced lunch. Data will be examined during weekly department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Warren (ann.warren@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, progress monitoring and intervention, Critical Thinking class for 30 minutes per day to focus on learning gaps.

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

Adding intervention time to students schedules through the Critical Thinking class will provide students with additional time to access previously taught skills in order to address gaps in learning.

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. Review students' previous PM1, PM2, and PM3 scores.
2. Students will take Progress Learning diagnostics.
3. A learning pathway will be developed for each student to address learning gaps.
4. Teacher monitor progress.
5. Follow up progress monitoring through Progress Learning will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth.
6. Student pathways will be redefined as needed.

Person Responsible: Ann Warren (ann.warren@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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 for 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 Venice will decrease the amount of truant students from 20% to 10%.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Warren (ann.warren@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 Critical Thinking 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 rates on a bi-weekly basis via Critical Thinking 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 plan for the student.
5. Progress monitor action plan with updated parent contact as needed.

Person Responsible: Ann Warren (ann.warren@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to

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 are not performing at the same level as their peers in both ELA and Math.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 discussed by and presented by the 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: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$4,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0110 - Sky Academy Venice	General Fund		$4,400.00
			Notes: Progress Learning program for students.			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$4,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0110 - Sky Academy Venice	General Fund		$4,400.00
			Notes: Progress Learning program for students.			
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0110 - Sky Academy Venice	General Fund		$5,000.00
			Notes: Funding to help support our PBIS program which encourages attendance.			
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice:				$0.00
					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