

Pinellas County Schools

Skyview 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Skyview Elementary School

8601 60TH ST N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

<http://www.skyview-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.

Educate every student for Florida Standard grade level core content proficiency and beyond in preparation for Middle School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Learning 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
Hamm, Katie	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Student Safety, and Facilities Management.
Wike, Victoria	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Assessment Coordinator, and Curriculum Management.
LeFleur, Christin	Teacher, ESE	

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.

*Staff contributed reflective feedback and provided input in two ways: Individually through a response survey, and as a Small-Group focused on a particular SIP Goal.

*Students completed Climate Surveys and responded to student generated questions aligned to improving student learning and experience in school.

*Families completed Climate Surveys.

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))

Student performance data will be monitored through STAR, FAST, and intervention data. Instructional Leadership Team will review and adjust plans as needed.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	3	4	16	11	7	13	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	12	3	5	9	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	0	10	10	4	11	5	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	32	18	0	0	0	78	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	34	16	0	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	11	20	7	15	0	0	0	60	
	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	12	17	21	42	39	0	0	0	131

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	20	25	22	24	16	0	0	0	107	
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	27	18	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	32	16	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	8	8	4	0	0	0	22	

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	1	0	7	0	0	0	9

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	20	25	22	24	16	0	0	0	107	
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	27	18	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	32	16	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	8	8	4	0	0	0	22	

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	1	0	7	0	0	0	9

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	45	55	56	47	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	62	62	61	55	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71	55	52	60	54	53
Math Achievement*	53	62	60	58	61	63
Math Learning Gains	57	65	64	63	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47	54	55	41	48	51
Science Achievement*	42	57	51	53	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	59			77		

** 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

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	38	Yes	2	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	48			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	45	62	71	53	57	47	42					59
SWD	13	52	69	22	38	46	25					
ELL	37	62		41	62		23					59
AMI												
ASN	70	78		67	72		64					76
BLK	28	56		31	33		18					
HSP	33	53	67	46	59	47	27					52
MUL	53			59								
PAC												

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
WHT	48	64	74	58	59	71	52					
FRL	41	63	75	53	55	42	35					55

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	45	64	42	55	70	74	55					67
SWD	20	44		25	63		20					
ELL	40	62		57	86		62					67
AMI												
ASN	71			75								85
BLK	21			21								
HSP	35	62		58	68		62					60
MUL	28			44								
PAC												
WHT	51	69		59	72		63					
FRL	44	63	42	56	66	73	56					77

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	47	55	60	58	63	41	53					77
SWD	16	38	56	41	59	50	18					
ELL	46	64	90	58	67	46	65					77
AMI												
ASN	72	72		81	76		92					77
BLK	22	36		30	64							
HSP	46	58	69	57	56	46	53					75
MUL	56			63								
PAC												
WHT	45	52	64	57	64	39	45					
FRL	42	50	60	51	56	29	45					62

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	43%	57%	-14%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	62%	-15%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	66%	-16%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	51%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

1st Grade Math had our lowest growth performance as compared to our Area and County's performance from PM1 to PM3. ELA proficiency dropped 5 percentage points from last year. We finished at 40% of our Intermediate students at proficiency in ELA.

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

ELA in grades 3-5 could be attributed to the new Benchmarks, gaps in instruction, new Modules (Content Curriculum), and a different assessment measure.

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.

Grade 4 ELA had the greatest gap. Possible reasons for gap could be attributed to clustering our ELL students into one Homeroom, the new Benchmarks, gaps in instruction, new Modules (Content Curriculum), and a different assessment measure.

Increased instructional support will be implemented as well as diversifying the student population in each class to be more representative of our student body.

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

Science proficiency showed a 15 point gain from last year. We implemented several new strategies that contributed: Science text focused Reading Intervention content; Sci Fri during 5th Grade lunchtime with experiments, review, and gaming based on the lowest performing Diagnostic data, and we also held a Science morning in-depth science hands-on review prior to a school-to-school competition where we took the almost proficient students needing an extra push. 55% of the students that competed became proficient on the SSA.

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

High number of absences is the most concerning. The second highest concern is the number of students scoring at a Level 1 in both ELA and Math.

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

- *Improved planning for data-based instruction, ensuring Teacher Clarity and student growth.
- *Attendance given a greater priority through relationships and contact with impacted families by teachers and CST.
- *Utilization of the MTSS process to better identify, intervene, support and monitor the progress of student content and behavior.
- *Push-in support model during ELA intervention to provide more hands-on instruction, less time out of classrooms, and consistent fidelity of supports.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Strengthening our Benchmark-aligned Instruction from PreK3 through 5th Grade across all Content Areas will improve student proficiency. There was only one content area where we surpassed our district's growth from PM1 to PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Skyview's students will improve to 62% proficiency in grades PK3 - 5th Grade across all content areas - ELA, Math, and Science as measured during PM3 on STAR and FAST across ELA, Math, and 5th Grade Science.

Monitoring:

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

Formative Assessments, Administrative walk-throughs, and Data Chats conducted will monitor in phases leading up to and between PM1 and PM3.

MTSS, PLCs, Collaborative Planning and One-on-One (Admin/Teacher) chats will be utilized to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hamm (hammk@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.)

Teacher Clarity will be strengthened by use of posting and referencing Learning Targets for each day's lesson at the beginning, during, and at the conclusion of each lesson. Appropriate Learning Targets will be selected based on Benchmark expectations during Grade Level Collaborative Planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

High Effect Size rating of Teacher Clarity based on John Hattie's research of meta-analysis.

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.

Learning Targets will be posted in every classroom for all Content Areas daily. Learning Targets will be referenced throughout each lesson.

Teachers may utilize I can statements, Learning Boards, or Lesson Objective/Target/Goal.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily via Administrator walk-through with observation specifically related to student interaction with Learning Targets.

Collaborative Planning weekly with Grade Level team across content areas.
Use of B1G-M and MTRs for math planning. FSASS will be implemented for science planning in grades 1st-5th. Utilize Gold Documents and Primary Pink Pages in ELA planning.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Lesson planning will be tightly aligned to the task and depth of the benchmark being addressed.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

Implement ELA and Math Interventions with fidelity and progress monitoring through small group work, I-Station, Dreambox, classroom formative checks, ELFAC, and teacher observation.

Person Responsible: Victoria Wike (wikev@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily interventions provided. Monthly progress monitoring.

MTSS framework followed by teachers, MTSS coaches, Administrators, and Student Services team to support the identification and continued, monitored growth.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly, Quarterly, and at each Progress Monitoring period.

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback that is timely, specific, and non-judgmental and opportunities to use the feedback received).

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily - planned for during weekly Collaborative Planning.

#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.

Content-focused Family events will be presented to provide information, strategies, and hands-on make and takes to make home-school connections in ELA, Math, and Science.

Parent Academy feedback this year indicated parents wanted more content focused information and earlier in the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is that 50% of our families attend an evening event focused on content information for their children throughout the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Sign-in sheets will be collected and utilized for targeting on-going invitations to families to attend.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hamm (hammk@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.)

Parental Involvement has a .50 effect size.

Philosophy in schools has a .43 effect size.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Family engagement and PBIS are both focuses for increasing the productivity of our climate and culture. All have an effect size of greater than one year's growth.

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.

Monitoring attendance of events and conferences (Title 1 Compact). Coordinating efforts to communicate to those that have not attended with specific invites for remaining events.

Person Responsible: Christin LeFleur (leflaurc@pcsb.org)

By When: April 2, 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 achieved a 38% of points on the Federal Index indicating a need to improve the proficiency across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Students with Disabilities will grow their overall scores from PM1 to PM3 at or greater than growth among comparable Area and District subgroup data.

Monitoring:

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

Formative Assessments, Administrative walk-throughs, and Data Chats conducted will monitor in phases leading up to and between PM1 and PM3.

MTSS, PLCs, Collaborative Planning and One-on-One (Admin/Teacher) chats will be utilized to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hamm (hammk@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.)

Strategic interventions to close learning gaps as identified by the case manage as the SDI on their IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specially Designed Instruction is data-based to target specific learning gaps.

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.

Push-in model of support whenever and wherever best for students to maintain time on instruction and embed supports with grade-level tasks.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily for implementation. As needed for IEP creation, review, updates.

Collaborative Planning weekly with Grade Level team across content areas. Use of B1G-M and MTRs for math planning. FSASS will be implemented for science planning in grades 1st-5th. Utilize Gold Documents and Primary Pink Pages in ELA planning.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: weekly

#4. 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.

Our Black/African American students are performing below their non-Black/African American peers. They scored at 33% on the Federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Black/African American students will grow their overall scores from PM1 to PM3 at or greater than the growth of our non-Black/African American students.

Monitoring:

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

Formative Assessments, Administrative walk-throughs, and Data Chats conducted will monitor in phases leading up to and between PM1 and PM3.

MTSS, PLCs, Collaborative Planning and One-on-One (Admin/Teacher) chats will be utilized to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hamm (hammk@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.)

Daily Interventions provided with fidelity through the use of the push-in model targeted specifically to gaps and learning needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Consistent and targeted interventions will close gaps and increase learning. MTSS process will assist with identifying current status and targeted interventions to implement.

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.

Interventions provided based on data and administered with fidelity

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

Collaborative Planning weekly with Grade Level team across content areas.

Use of B1G-M and MTRs for math planning. FSASS will be implemented for science planning in grades 1st-5th. Utilize Gold Documents and Primary Pink Pages in ELA planning.

Person Responsible: Katie Hamm (hammk@pcsb.org)

By When: weekly

#5. 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.

Student attendance at school means that there is greater time on task.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to improve school-wide Average Daily Attendance to 96%.

Monitoring:

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

Focus Absence Reports monitored weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hamm (hammk@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.)

Proactive communications emphasizing the importance of attendance and the detrimental outcomes of chronic absenteeism.

Positive Contact with students and families impacted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Use of Attendance Works and following state statute required steps to improve attendance rates.

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.

Attendance Matters Spirit week in late August.

Person Responsible: Victoria Wike (wikev@pcsb.org)

By When: Sept 1, 2023

PBIS Rewards for attendance and improved attendance.

Person Responsible: Victoria Wike (wikev@pcsb.org)

By When: May 29, 2024

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)).

SAC approves expenditures aligned to our SIP for the improvement of academic performance of our students.

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Partnership with Academic coaching through our school-based MTSS coach as well as district Instructional Staff Developers to facilitate coaching cycles and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

K-2 goals are to achieve ELA proficiency for at least 62% of our students as measured during PM3 on STAR.

Spring 2023 K-2 data averaged 62% ELA proficiency and we hope to replicate that within the 23-24 cohort of K-2 students.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd-5th goals are to achieve ELA proficiency for at least 62% of our students as measured during PM3 on FAST.

Spring 2023 3-5 data averaged 40% ELA proficiency and we hope to perform significantly better on the 2024 assessment.

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.

Data will be monitored by teachers, administration, and School Based Leadership Team on a continuous basis. Summative data points will be monitored across STAR and FAST Progress Monitoring cycles 1, 2, and 3. We will also monitor Running Records, ELFAC, Module assessments and classroom formative data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hamm, Katie, hammk@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?
- o Provide print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
 - o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
 - o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
 - o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
 - o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
 - o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

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?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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
o Literacy Leadership ? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. ? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. ? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection	Hamm, Katie, hammk@pcsb.org
o Assessment ? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs ? Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.	Hamm, Katie, hammk@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.

Our school webpage: <https://www.pcsb.org/skyview-es>

Our Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/skyviewelm/>

Information will also be posted for review in our Title 1 Family Station in the Front Office.

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))

Our school webpage: <https://www.pcsb.org/skyview-es>

Our Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/skyviewelm/>

Information will also be posted for review in our Title 1 Family Station in the Front Office.

Lunch with Loved Ones occurs every Friday by opening our campus for families to come on campus and have lunch with their child(ren).

PTA and Family Events are scheduled in the evenings for families to attend and learn more about academic content, how to support their child(ren) and to have access to staff for any questions.

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)

Instructional Practices will be aligned to student growth as measured by FAST, STAR, Intervention data, ELFAC, Observation data, and common assessments.

MTSS framework will identify and monitor students needing additional supports. We are implementing daily push-in during intervention to increase time on task, and fidelity of supports.

Collaborative Planning will occur weekly for grade-levels and content to be able to deepen the tasks aligned to Benchmarks.

Lessons will be implemented with tightly aligned Learning Targets referenced before, during, and after instruction.

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))

NA