

Pinellas County Schools

Skycrest Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Skycrest Elementary School

10 N CORONA AVE, Clearwater, FL 33765

<http://www.skycrest-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

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.

Inspiring greatness through academics, culture and leadership

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student 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
Caparaso, Anne	Principal	The principal performs administrative duties involving supervising personnel, budget, staffing, curriculum and plant operations. The principal oversees the operational management and monitoring of instruction at the school.
Pierzchalski, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Leads the school along side the principal with both school operations and instruction. Performs all duties of the principal in the principal's absence.

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.

Planning committee was formed which included members of the instructional staff and support staff. Families also provided input through PTA and SAC meetings. Information from the district climate survey was also used to create the plan.

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))

SIP will be monitored monthly through SBLT and during PLCS. The SIP goals will drive the work on campus and will be adjusted if the data supports a change in the plan. Will also review after each state progress monitoring.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 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	0	42	21	28	33	32	0	0	0	156	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	35	16	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	20	0	0	0	49	
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	1	0	6	0	0	0	7

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	42	21	28	33	32	31	0	0	0	187	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	16	24	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	20	21	0	0	0	70	
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	1	0	6	8	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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	42	21	28	33	32	31	0	0	0	187	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	16	24	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	20	21	0	0	0	70	
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	1	0	6	8	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	38	55	56	46	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	52	62	61	54	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50	55	52	45	54	53
Math Achievement*	50	62	60	57	61	63
Math Learning Gains	68	65	64	63	61	62

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55	54	55	48	48	51
Science Achievement*	39	57	51	44	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	66			73		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	55			
AMI				

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%
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
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)

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	38	52	50	50	68	55	39					66
SWD	12	36	30	26	60	50	7					65
ELL	37	58	64	51	72	52	40					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	35		35	55	45	23					
HSP	42	59	65	53	68	52	45					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	35	45	40	49	76		33					
FRL	39	53	44	48	66	51	42					65

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	36	45	42	46	48	31	35					60
SWD	19	32	42	21	25	20	15					54

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
ELL	34	56	53	50	54	31	34					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13	7		20	15		7					
HSP	38	53	50	53	55	35	36					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45	45		47	53		53					
FRL	34	48	40	46	49	32	35					59

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	46	54	45	57	63	48	44					73
SWD	19	48	50	30	47	43	6					68
ELL	42	58	50	60	68	46	43					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	37	42	36	34		24					
HSP	44	57	48	61	69	43	48					73
MUL	58			58								
PAC												
WHT	59	58		55	67	83	50					
FRL	46	55	43	56	61	49	46					73

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	47%	57%	-10%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	66%	-19%	61%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	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 shows the lowest performance. Contributing factors are ongoing attendance issues and the many of the students living in homes who do not speak English at home.

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

Attendance continues to be the biggest problem area. 187 students have more than 10% absences. This is across grade levels but Kindergarten is the largest amount. Parents do not understand the importance of the school day in the earlier grades.

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 ELA proficiency continues to be the biggest gap again because of attendance the large ELL population at our school. The gap is closing which is a positive trend.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement raising 11percentage points from the previous year. The school had a great focus on science through, extend day science tutoring, science games during lunch, rigorous science instruction and the use of science text during ELA time as well as during science.

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

Attendance and sub group data are an area of concern.

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

Attendance, Differentiation for small group instruction and vocabulary.

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 Black/African-American**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.

Half of all students are not proficient in ELA, math and science. If students receive daily targeted intervention, the learning gap for students will decrease

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency scores and learning gains will increase to 60% of students being proficient schoolwide as measured by STAR (primary), FAST (3-5), and SSA in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by teachers, coaches and administration, through observations, classroom assessments and state progress monitoring in the fall, winter and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anne Caparaso (caparaso@pcsb.org)

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.)

Master schedule is created with designated intervention blocks where small group instruction occurs daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When students are instructed in a small group environment to address specific deficits students achievement will improve.

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.

Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs to analyze student work and data to plan for future lessons with appropriate scaffolds to address gaps in learning.

Person Responsible: Anne Caparaso (caparaso@pcsb.org)

By When: This will occur weekly throughout the 2023-2024 School year.

Academic Coaches will provide teachers with targeted coaching cycles as for small group instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Anne Caparaso (caparaso@pcsb.org)

By When: This will occur as needed throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. 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.

Creating a campus of leaders where all staff and students feel connected and have a trusted person they can feel cares about them

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome will be a positive climate and culture felt by all stakeholders.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored and measured through feedback from surveys completed by all stakeholders mid year and after all schoolwide events.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Pierzchalski (pierzchalskil@pcsb.org)

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.)

The staff and students will utilize the Leader In Me Framework including the 7 Healthy Habits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the Leader In Me framework, will create a common language and an environment where all individuals are valued.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

Black students make up 19% of the school and historically perform below other subgroups. Targeted small group intervention will be used to address this need in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Black students will increase their ELA proficiency from 43% to 50% as measured by the FAST assessment in May of 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teacher, academic coaches and administration will monitor through classroom assessments, district assessment and both the fall and winter FAST Progress monitoring.

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.)

Small group intervention directed at the area students most need will take place daily during the intervention block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will allow the teachers to address students specific deficits and ensure that they are able to meet the grade level benchmark.

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 2 - Moderate 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

#4. 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.

15% of students at Skycrest have an identified disability which impacts their learning. There level of proficiency in ELA is significantly below the schools.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD at Skycrest will increase proficiency in ELA from 30% to 42% as measured by the state FAST assessment in May of 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored from the General education teacher and ESE teacher as well as administration and academic coaches. Progress and adjustments to instruction will take place after Fall FAST and the Winter FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Pierzchalski (pierzchalskil@pcsb.org)

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.)

UFLI small group/ individual phonics instruction and the Flamingo model will be used to address student deficits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies explicitly help students to learn and follow a scope and sequence which will ensure that gaps in their learning are minimized.

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 3 - Promising 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)).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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

K-2 students who scored below 50% on the state progress monitoring in ELA will be given daily small group instruction aligned to the Science of Reading to increase ELA proficiency. Students will be given explicit reading instruction using UFLI and the Flamingo model.

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

3rd through 5th grade students scored below 50% proficiency on the FAST ELA state assessment. (3rd grade-47%, 4th Grade-42%,and 5th Grade -47%). Because of this deficiency small group instruction will be focused on to provide targeted intervention and monitoring of growth.

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

60% of students in K-2 will be proficient in ELA as measured by the STAR reading assessment in May 2024

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

60% of students in 3rd through 5th grades will score a 3 or above in the FAST ELA assessment in May 2024.

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.

K-2 students will be monitored through the STAR reading assessment 3 times during the 2023-2024 school year as well as Dibels biweekly for students underperforming. 3rd through 5th grade students will be monitored using the state FAST assessment 3 times during the 2023-2024 school year. Students will also be monitored through district module assessments throughout the school year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Caparaso, Anne, caparaso@pcsb.org

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?

To address the deficits in reading K-5, teachers will use small group instruction during core and intervention ELA blocks to address the specific standards that students are struggling with. When appropriate, teachers will use the UFLI program as well as the Flamingo small group model to address deficits.

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?

Due to our high level of EL students we have a significant number of students struggling with decoding and vocabulary. These skills can be addressed effectively using the programs discussed as well as addressing the specific grade level standards.

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
K-2 teachers will participate in the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative. This allows for an additional literacy coach to be on our campus 2 days a week to assist with collaborative planning, modeling instruction and offering actionable feedback.	Pierzchalski, Lisa, pierzchalskil@pcsb.org
3-5 teachers will participate in weekly PLCs and collaborative planning to ensure that ELA lessons are taught to the necessary rigor and that daily intervention occurs to assist the students struggling most.	Caparaso, Anne, caparaso@pcsb.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school improvement plan is disseminated in multiple ways. All stakeholders will have access to the SIP on our website, along with a one page more concise, and parent friendly version. The one pager will also be posted in multiple areas around the school including the school lobby. The SIP will be discussed at the Open House parent meeting and parents will have the opportunity to ask questions. The SIP and progress being made is also discussed at SAC meetings. Mid way through the year the principal will do a state of the school meeting to discuss the progress towards the SIP goals.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Skycrest has ongoing and multiple ways to communicate with parents. The school website, social media, school messenger system, student agendas, and student conferences are all used to keep parents up to date on the school and their student's progress. We also have monthly listen and learn sessions for parents to gain valuable information.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The academic program will be improved through monthly professional development for teachers, weekly PLCs and collaborative planning, and through ongoing observation and feedback from coaches and administration. Attendance will be addressed through bimonthly CST meetings where interventions and incentives will be developed to increase attendance. A clear set of academic expectations will be established at the start of the year and then monitored through walk throughs with targeted feedback.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Our plan is supported through our Title I resources. We have an MTSS coach who will assist at monitoring data and using it to ensure that interventions and quality instruction occurs. Our Title I funds are also used to support our family engagement activities including Literacy Night and other academic nights.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school ensures that all staff have training in youth mental health so at the very least they are aware of issues and can alert the student services team who can then inquire further and provide appropriate services and resources.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

A formal MTSS process is in place for both behavior and academic issues that occur. Levels of support are offered and then monitored to determine next steps.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

PD is provided both in whole staff meetings and PLCs monthly to increase teacher effectiveness. Data is reviewed and based on the needs PD is tailored to address that need. PD is also determined based on administration and coach walkthroughs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Pre-school students and their families are invited to visit the school prior to the start of the school year and also assessed prior to the school year to determine readiness and then grouped accordingly.