



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Skyline Elementary School

620 SW 19TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

<http://sky.leeschools.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Laura Trombetti**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Skyline Elementary School

620 SW 19TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

<http://sky.leeschools.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">83%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">54%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

## 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.**

We will inspire each other to be leaders with our awesome attitudes and exceptional behavior.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Today's Learners, Tomorrow's Leaders

### 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
Trombetti, Laura	Principal	Provide instructional leadership at the assigned school that will ensure continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provide organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high performance expectations for all stakeholders.
Gurgal, Jill	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assume full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building.
Fenske, Renee	Administrative Support	Provide assistance and ongoing professional development to teachers, including training, coaching, and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies, and best practices to generate improvement in reading/literacy instruction and student achievement.
Taveras, Jhonathan	Instructional Technology	Facilitate and support the integration of technology and assistive technology into the classroom and home to support effective instruction and learning
Schmitt, Stephanie	Dean	Ms. Schmitt processes referrals and works collaboratively with teachers to proactively prevent behavior in the classroom to decrease referrals. She is in charge of our PBIS team which worked to create a common language on campus and holds monthly meetings to improve behavior.
Skocik, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Skocik is the primary specialist. She is in charge of K-2 PLCs and collaborates with teachers to plan interventions in the classroom and analyze data to monitor effectiveness.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2016, Laura Trombetti

**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.*

1

**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.*

10



**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	110	139	145	158	149	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	845
Attendance below 90 percent	60	23	11	12	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	2	7	4	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	2	4	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	2	5	2	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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	7	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 10/25/2020

**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	16	12	8	33	31	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	7	14	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

**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	16	12	8	33	31	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

**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	1	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	16	12	8	33	31	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	7	14	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

**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	16	12	8	33	31	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

**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	1	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	58%	57%	57%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	56%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	54%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	67%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	65%	62%	62%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	54%	51%	51%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	52%	53%	51%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
	2018	66%	58%	8%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	62%	-6%	64%	-8%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						

**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	23	33	27	31	39	29	24				
ELL	48	38	37	66	58	29	48				
BLK	50	17		59	39		25				
HSP	54	46	38	62	50	31	40				
MUL	67			53							
WHT	61	51	51	66	61	46	63				
FRL	50	42	39	57	51	36	44				
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	24	33	35	31	35	31	37				
ELL	38	50	50	63	51	40	43				
ASN	50			90							
BLK	42	40		42	45						
HSP	54	53	34	66	55	39	60				
MUL	77	50		54	40						
WHT	61	48	45	67	53	49	65				
FRL	55	50	40	63	55	44	61				
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	12	35	40	31	46	39	9				
ELL	39	41	50	50	36	38					
BLK	55	64		60	64						
HSP	53	45	46	62	56	52	47				
MUL	59	64		71	64						
WHT	62	47	53	70	64	50	53				
FRL	53	44	53	63	60	54	51				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50

Hispanic Students	
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	49
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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the L25 students making learning gains in math. During the past 3 years, we show a decreasing trend from 51% making LG in 16-17, 41% in 17-18, and 37% in 18-19. During these years, we have implemented new programs for ELA such as Top Score Writing and I-Ready. Although I-Ready was implemented for ELA and Math, ELA was a focus. Tutoring was also designed for ELA and math this year, instead of just focusing on math.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 17-18 school year is science as it decreased from 62% proficient to 52% proficient. Students receive science instruction from their

classroom teacher and during our 8-day specials rotation. More science instruction, including science reading material, needs to be utilized during the ELA block to increase background knowledge. Low basic reading skills also contribute to the low science scores. 54% of 5th grade students showed proficiency in ELA which is similar to the science proficiency.

**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.**

4th grade proficiency in ELA showed the greatest gap compared to the state. 51% of Skyline students showed proficiency in ELA while 58% of students throughout the state showed proficiency. Although this is the largest gap in the last 5 years, 4th grade students have historically been at or slightly below the state average. Skyline had 16 students who were promoted by Good Cause. This contributes to the lower proficiency. Skyline needs to tailor interventions more strategically to close the achievement gaps in 4th grade students. This year, Skyline had 3 out of 7 teachers who were new to 4th grade. This could have contributed to the lower proficiency due to teachers learning the curriculum and expectations.

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

The data component showing the greatest improvement was the percent of students making learning gains in math. We improved from 53% making learning gains in 17-18 to 56% making learning gains in 18-19. We implemented I-Ready in math which allowed teachers to pinpoint gaps in their students' learning. This helped them to tailor interventions to meet students' needs. Another area that we have maintained includes ELA proficiency. We implemented I-Ready this year which helps teachers to design specific interventions to meet the needs of their students. This includes the Diagnostic, LAFS workbook, and the computer component.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern. We had 60 students with attendance below 90%, which increased by 5 students from last year. The grade-levels with the greatest concern are Kindergarten and 3rd grade. Another concern is our 4th grade achievement. We have 31 4th grade students in the EWS. Last year, 53 of these students were suspended 1 or more time. Behavior was a focus last year and will continue to be this year in order to decrease these suspensions even more.

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

1. ESSA Data - ESSA Data indicates a need for improvement in both ESE and African American students. We will target interventions based on progress monitoring for these subgroups. Resources have been specifically allocated to serve students in the ESE subgroup.
2. L25 Math Learning Gains - Interventions need to be tailored and these students need to be a specific focus for coaches and teachers. Each grade-level already receives a list of L25 students with their demographic information including ESE and ESOL. This should be a discussion focus at PLCs and reviewed frequently.
3. WIN Time - There needs to be a stronger and more focused implementation of WIN. This will be built in to the master schedule. We will also include science content in ELA interventions to review Grade 3 and 4 standards for 5th grade students to help improve background knowledge.
4. PLC - Our PLC process needs improvement. Academic Coaches will create agendas and get them approved by administration to ensure that PLCs are data-based in order to improve achievement.
5. Feedback - Improve feedback to teachers on more walkthroughs by creating a walkthrough schedule. Allow for more open conversations with teachers to guide feedback.



## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency from 64% to 69% as measured by the FY21 Math FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

Tutoring: Focus standards and instruction based on data (4th Grade: Fractions; 5th Grade: Fractions).  
 PLCS need to review student error analysis and student work.  
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.  
 PLC protocols will be distributed and reinforced.  
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed to improve on pacing and exposure to all standards.

**Evidence-based Strategy:** More exposure to on-grade-level standards is needed.  
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students will continue to provide differentiation.  
 Coaches, ESSA Subgroup Teachers meet quarterly with district contacts to differentiate interventions, analyze data.  
 Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions and enrichment  
 I-Ready Diagnostic provides guide for interventions and enrichment  
 WIN time is scheduled at the same time throughout the grade-level to maximize resources and support  
 High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings will occur quarterly in PLCs.  
 Administrative classroom walkthroughs based on High Yield Strategies and Student Engagement  
 SWD are served in co-taught classrooms with an ESE resource teacher.  
 Paraprofessionals provide extra support within these classrooms  
 Progress monitoring is based on students' IEPs  
 Progress of African American students monitored through I-Ready/formatives and instruction will be differentiated accordingly.  
 Skyline Smiles campaign with targeted mentoring for L25 and ESSA students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who are proficient in grade-level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Data indicates that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. The plan will be monitored through the action steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroups - ESE and African American students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Weekly PLCS to review student error analysis and student work (academic coach, teachers)
2. Weekly PLC meeting notes (Academic Coach)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, coach)
4. Progress monitoring with ESE resource teacher to differentiate (teachers, ESE resource teacher)
5. Classroom walkthroughs
6. Leadership Team Meetings

7. Quarterly meetings and frequent collaboration with district contacts to plan PLCs, analyze data, and individualize interventions (coordinator, coach, teachers)

Progress will be monitored in PLCs with teachers, coaches, and administrators. The leadership team will discuss this information to plan next steps. District level coaches will also be involved in the PLC process and assist in planning targeted interventions based on data.

**Person Responsible** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase percent of students making Math L25 Learning Gains from 37% to 45% as measured by the FY21 Math FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

More exposure to on-grade-level standards is needed.  
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.  
 PLC protocols will be distributed and reinforced.  
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed.  
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students will continue to provide differentiation.

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Tutoring to focus on math standards based on data (4th – fractions, 5th – fractions)  
 L25 data discussion with administration quarterly during lunch  
 High Yield Instructional Strategy PD during PLCs monthly  
 District support through Curriculum Specialists for data analysis and lesson planning for specific interventions  
 Quarterly analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic  
 Additional support added to classrooms with L25 students and ESSA subgroups - ESE resource teacher, paraprofessional  
 Title I teacher and resource teacher in 4th grade to decrease class size.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who are proficient in grade-level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Our L25 students in math have shown a downward trend so these interventions are in place to support teachers to ensure they are specifically geared toward students' needs. Data indicates that additional support is needed to improve learning gains. The plan will be monitored through the action steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroups - ESE and African American students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Weekly PLCS to review student error analysis and student work (academic coach, teachers)
2. Weekly PLC meeting notes (Academic Coach)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, coach)
4. PD with district-level math coaches to plan differentiated instruction for ESE students in L25 (ESSA subgroup).
5. I-Ready Data - lessons passed, standards tracking for intervention planning, grade-level intervention block
6. Adjusting teachers who teach 4th and 5th grade to improve interventions for ESSA subgroup students. These teachers have specific training in differentiation.

Progress will be monitored in PLCs with teachers, coaches, and administrators. The leadership team will discuss this information to plan next steps. District level coaches will also be involved in the PLC process and assist in planning targeted interventions based on data.

**Person Responsible** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency from 58% to 63% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 More exposure to on-grade-level standards is needed.  
 Curriculum Map and Instructional Guide Training  
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.  
 PLC protocols will be distributed and reinforced.  
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed.  
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students will continue to provide differentiation.  
 Continuation of Top Score and implementation in 2nd and 3rd grade.  
 Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions and enrichment  
 Interventions are individualized through I-Ready Diagnostic, Student Learning Paths, Read 180, formatives, and classroom performance.  
 WIN Time is scheduled at the same time throughout the grade-level so that interventions and enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.  
 High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings will occur quarterly in PLCs.  
 Administrative classroom walkthroughs based on High Yield Strategies and Student Engagement  
 SWD are served in co-taught classrooms with an ESE resource teacher.  
 Class sizes are smaller for an improved student to teacher ratio.  
 Paraprofessionals provide extra support within these classrooms  
 Progress monitoring is based on students' IEPs  
 Progress of African American (ESSA subgroup) students will be monitored through I-Ready and formatives and instruction will be differentiated accordingly.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who are proficient in grade-level standards are college and career ready aligns with district goals and vision. Data indicates that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. The plan will be monitored through the action steps below. Additional supports are added for ESSA subgroups - ESE and African American students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Weekly PLCS to review student error analysis and student work (academic coach, teachers)
2. Weekly PLC meeting notes (Academic Coach)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, coach)
4. Progress monitoring with ESE resource teacher to differentiate (teachers, ESE resource teacher)
5. Classroom walkthroughs
6. Leadership Team Meetings to review data
7. PLC Planning with ESE Coordinator to plan PLC meetings and analyze data/needs (coordinator, coaches, teachers)

Progress will be monitored in PLCs with teachers, coaches, and administrators. The leadership team will discuss this information to plan next steps. District level coaches will also be involved in the PLC process and assist in planning targeted interventions based on data.

**Person Responsible** Laura Trombetti (lauraat@leeschools.net)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready and FOCUS discipline data.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the number of students receiving ISS or OSS from 56 students to 45 as measured by SESIR reported in FOCUS by June 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Restructuring our discipline plan to include a Tiger Card for a more consistent, school-wide approach.  
 Include PBS and Growth Mindset strategies school-wide.  
 Support staff (ESE resource teacher) on each grade-level for social skills instruction and support.  
 Support for and communication with bus drivers.  
 Use of a time-out room who provides reflection and instruction.  
 Addition of another school counselor for mental health concerns.  
 Leadership Strategies and Growth Mindset philosophy to decrease bullying.  
 Parental Involvement and presentation on social media concerns to increase awareness and decrease bullying.  
 Book study: Growth Mindset  
 Kagan Trainings  
 Dean of Discipline to assist with Tier 3 interventions and small social skill groups  
 Monthly PBIS meetings  
 Development of school-wide common language

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We decreased from 3% (31 ISS/OSS) to 2% (26 ISS/OSS) from 17-18 to 18-19.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly PBIS Meetings to discuss Tier 3 students (administration, dean)
2. Weekly Social Emotional Groups (school counselor, behavior specialist)
3. Bi-Weekly Book Study/referral discussion at faculty meetings (staff)
4. Bi-Weekly discussion at PLC about referral data and classroom management strategies (grade-level specific)

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Schmitt (stephanieas@leeschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready and EWS data.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Decrease the percent of chronically absent students from 24% (93 out of 386) to 20% (77 out of 386) as measured by the House tab in the Early Warning System in Castle by May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Renee Fenske (reneejf@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Attendance Review Committee Meetings bi-weekly.</p> <p>Classroom and school-wide incentives for on-time arrival.</p> <p>Parent Involvement Clerk Typist (Title I Funded) communicate with families of students who were frequently absent/tardy.</p> <p>Student Leadership Opportunity: Safety Patrols will greet families in the car line by saying, "Thank you for being on time!"</p> <p>Classroom-based clubs and incentives for attendance.</p> <p>Incentives for bus drivers for on time arrival (drawings for prizes).</p> <p>Quarterly meetings with bus drivers to build relationships, help with behavior management, support.</p> <p>Teachers will be tracking attendance that automatically calculates those who are chronically absent.</p> <p>Social Worker involvement and communication.</p> <p>Skyline Smiles Campaign - specific students are targeted through this new initiative to mentor students based on L25, ESSA data, and attendance data.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We decreased from 37% to 24% of chronically absent students from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Quarterly bus meeting with assistant director of West Zone and bus drivers.
- Review district attendance report and share with staff and students (administration)
- Bi-Weekly ARC Meeting (social worker, intervention specialist)
- Quarterly drawings on the news for attendance

**Person Responsible** Renee Fenske (reneejf@leeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Administration will schedule WIN time so that it is consistent across the grade-level. This will allow for additional support from the primary specialist and resource teachers within the grade-level. The leadership team will also participate in and plan PLCs to ensure that they are data-based and solution focused to improve achievement and differentiated instruction.**

**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.

Skyline conducts many parent involvement opportunities and encourage families to attend. The opportunities include various activities such as academic, social/emotional, etc. We build relationships with community partners by inviting them into our school for mentorship, volunteerism, and/or donations. We discuss the Parent and Family Engagement Plan and seek input regarding our needs from all stakeholders at SAC Meetings. Data is provided based on students' achievement and how we can work together toward agreed-upon SIP goals. Stakeholders have the opportunity to provide input to SIP goals and the PFEP during SAC meetings. Progress toward SIP goals is reviewed at each SAC meeting which allowed stakeholders the opportunity to provide input and ask questions. PFEP events are reviewed during each SAC meeting. DAC information is reported to SAC members each quarter which allows all members the opportunity to have input.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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