

Sarasota County Schools

Sky Academy Venice



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Sky Academy Venice

701 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.skyatthey.com

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Forcier

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Sky Academy Venice

701 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.skyatthey.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	10%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	23%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part 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

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Novia, Robert	Principal	Observe, evaluate all teachers and support staff. Support all staff members to make SKY the most successful school it can be. with building partnerships with families and community. This is my 8th year as Principal of SKY Academy Venice.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/28/2020, Patricia Forcier

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	56	51	0	0	0	0	160	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	11	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	7	0	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	3	0	0	0	0	21	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	18	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	51	54	0	0	0	0	157	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	8	0	0	0	0	36	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	21	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	51	54	0	0	0	0	157
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	8	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	64%	54%	68%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	54%	70%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	50%	47%	70%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	76%	74%	58%	81%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	66%	57%	66%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	51%	57%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	61%	51%	67%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	85%	72%	0%	91%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	70%	63%	7%	54%	16%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	64%	-6%	52%	6%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	64%	66%	-2%	56%	8%
	2018	76%	70%	6%	58%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	67%	73%	-6%	54%	13%
	2018	76%	73%	3%	54%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	72%	65%	7%	46%	26%
	2018	46%	63%	-17%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	62%	-1%	48%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	62%	6%	50%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	85%	0%	71%	14%
2018	88%	80%	8%	71%	17%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
2018	97%	77%	20%	62%	35%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	12	20		29	53	45					
HSP	53	36		60	50						
WHT	67	67	62	78	70	60	64	85	58		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
FRL	74	74		74	63	50					
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	56		31	56	60					
HSP	53	64		64	69						
WHT	65	64	60	73	64	59	71	90	57		
FRL	41	55	71	70	74	91					
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	62	73	57	62	67					
HSP	56	67		82	65						
MUL	69	73		85	82						
WHT	70	72	69	81	66	60	68		51		
FRL	50	59	64	79	61		73		50		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	592
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

SWD in LA is our biggest area of concern. We are looking into providing more support for our SWD students with additional one on one time and additional on line tools.

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

SWD in LA went down 19%. Our number of students with needs in reading has increased.

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.

As a school we still are ahead of the state in every category although our SWD did fall below the 41% to 32%.

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

8th grade math saw a big increase of 26%. We did some additional tutoring sessions and had a unique low year the year prior.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We want to have a focus on helping our SWD. Many are showing learning gains but we want to put more of a focus on having our SWD on grade level.

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

1. SWD
2. Hispanic population LA/Reading learning gains
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Looking at our SWD data, we are planning to utilize more on one instruction with our ESE teacher and ESE aid for reading and math instruction. Many of our SWD will receive additional remediation built within our Master Schedule and will be part of our after school Academic Enrichment Program. IXL online diagnostic curriculum was purchased for teachers to integrate and utilize to assist with areas of concern for students. Three different level, high interest, nonfiction scholastic magazines were infused in our LA and Reading classes to increase focus on nonfiction text. SKY Academy will also have a school wide reading plan to increase time reading in LA classes and in our AfterSchool program.

Measurable Outcome: SWD at SKY Academy will show a 21% increase in Reading from 12% to 33% and in Math 21% to 50%..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Novia (robert.novia@skyatthey.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will increase one on one pull out instruction with our SWD students. We are also adding additional IXL on line diagnostic curriculum to assist teachers and students on areas of focus. Students will also be offered Academic Enrichment time with certified teachers monitoring progress in after school program. High interest nonfiction scholastic magazines utilized in all LA classes to increase focus on comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

IXL is a standards based curriculum that will assist students show academic growth in LA/ Reading and Math. One on One instruction with ESE teacher and ESE aide will assist students in fluency and comprehension. Additional time in Academic Enrichment Program with certified teachers will should assist students with additional instructional time on task. High interest nonfiction scholastic magazine and school wide reading program should assist with comprehension and overall passion for reading.

Action Steps to Implement

LA teachers will be responsible for implementing supplemental materials in LA and Reading class. ESE Liaison will hold IEP meetings and will work with Team leaders to update students on progress monitoring and reaching specific goals. . Academic Enrichment Program coordinator will be responsible for tracking and reporting data to Principal ,ESE Liaison and team leaders on data from afterschool AEP program with I Ready, IXL..

Person Responsible

Robert Novia (robert.novia@skyatthey.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Looking at our SKY Academy school wide data, there is a need to increase reading proficiency and learning gains in Reading/LA for our Hispanic population.

Measurable Outcome: Our SKY Academy Hispanic sub group will increase from 53% proficiency in LA/Reading to 60%.We will increase learning gains from 36% to 50% for the same Hispanic subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Novia (robert.novia@skyatthey.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Looking at our Hispanic subgroup population data, we are planning to utilize more on one instruction with our Reading aid for reading assistance. Our Hispanic students who are showing a need will receive additional remediation built within our Master Schedule and will be part of our after school Academic Enrichment Program.IXL online diagnostic curriculum will also be integrated and utilized to assist in assessing areas of concern for students. Three different level,high interest, nonfiction scholastic magazines were infused in our LA and Reading classes to increase focus on nonfiction text. SKY Academy will also have a school wide reading plan to increase time reading in LA classes and in our AfterSchool program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

IXL is a standards based curriculum that will assist students show academic growth in LA/ Reading. One on One instruction with Reading aide will assist students in fluency and comprehension. Additional time in Academic Enrichment Program with certified teachers will should assist students with additional instructional time on task.High interest nonfiction scholastic magazine and school wide reading program should assist with comprehension and overall passion for reading.

Action Steps to Implement

LA teachers will be responsible for implementing supplemental materials in LA and Reading class. ESOL Liaison will collaborate with Team leaders to update students on progress monitoring and reaching specific goals. . Academic Enrichment Program coordinator will be responsible for tracking and reporting data to Principal ,ESOL Liaison and team leaders on data from afterschool AEP program with I Ready, IXL..

Person Responsible

Robert Novia (robert.novia@skyatthey.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Team leaders and Admin will work with our ESE liaison to progress monitor our SWD to assess areas of growth and areas of concern.Team leaders , admin and AEP (Academic Enrichment Program) coordinator will collaborate about SWD and our Hispanic population progress in our Academic Enrichment Program. Teachers will discuss the effectiveness of the new IXL supplemental curriculum to assist our SWD and Hispanic population in showing reading gains. All teachers will enforce the additional time reading in LA class and in our afterschool program.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The first 10 minutes of the day we have all of our students in Home Room where we focus on a character curriculum "Creating a Culture of Kindness" . Teacher discuss important real life topics and emphasize the importance of high character. The Core Values of the YMCA are implemented in this curriculum Caring, Honesty, Respect, Responsibility are the values that are emphasized with our character education curriculum. Students are recognized and rewarded quarterly for upholding our core values and "creating a culture of kindness". We also have a mentor program where every student is assigned to a teacher or staff member and every other week we meet with our group of mentees to discuss the Core Values, discuss goal setting, academic concerns, current events, etc. This assures that every single SKY student has a dedicated staff member that they can go to in a time of distress. It also reinforces our Character Education curriculum as we discuss how we can improve as an individuals as well.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00