

The School District of Lee County

Skyline Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	0

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

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Skyline Elementary School

620 SW 19TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">90%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">52%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		C	C	C

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	Position 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	Instructional Media	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.*

11

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.*

66

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

971

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	153	129	154	175	158	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	12	31	28	25	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	8	10	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	26	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	6	8	9	18	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	57%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	56%	58%	49%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	50%	53%	40%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	62%	63%	66%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	65%	62%	53%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	54%	51%	41%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	52%	53%	62%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		13/12.4	19/16	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.3		5/20	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/6.7		2/12.5	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		6/6	19/16.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6		7/30.4	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0		4/26.7	0/0
		Grade 2			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		8/7.3	38/31.7	1/50
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6		0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0		0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		5/4.9	16/13.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1		1/7.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/21.4		0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/33.3	64/45.1	80/53.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/19	12/48	11/44
	English Language Learners	1/8.3	4/23.5	3/15.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/17.5	44/32.6	69/47.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.8	3/13.6	5/23.8
	English Language Learners	1/8.3	1/6.3	3/15.8
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34/28.6	52/41.3	58/44.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.5	2/9.5	1/5.0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/7	22/17.7	38/29.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/10
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/9.1

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		46/34.3	70/47.3	71/48
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/10	2/10	3/15
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	1/6.7
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		22/16.4	55/38.2	65/43.6
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	2/10.5	3/15
	English Language Learners		0/0	2/14.3	1/6.7
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		46/32.6	74/50.7	80/54.4
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/10	3/15.8	5/25
	English Language Learners		2/14.3	2/14.3	2/13.3

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	41	33	26	32	38	17				
ELL	34	48	54	36	42	38	28				
BLK	52			48							
HSP	51	52	48	46	48	35	38				
MUL	52			48							
WHT	62	48		59	55		60				
FRL	48	52	58	44	39	21	44				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends for the percentage of students scoring 3-5 on the FSA for grades 4 and 5, showed decreases in ELA and Math. However, the trend for grade 3 students scoring 3-5 showed an increase in ELA and Math. Percentage of SWD and Black/African American students that scored 3-5 are both below 41%. Fifth grade science percentage of student scoring 3-5 is trending down from 52% to 48%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are Integration of Knowledge and background knowledge. Science progress monitoring showed a positive trend for our students, however, the scores fell below our expectations.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Students' limited and/or different background knowledge and limited resources for teachers to use for Integration of knowledge are contributing factors for the need for improvement. In the future to improve, we will devote time at PLCs to share best practices/resources and reach out to our Leading and Learning team members.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement were I-Ready reading supports, WIN time implemented at all grade levels and common planning time to allow for collaboration/sharing best practices.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Leading and Learning Representatives at each grade level. I-Ready trainings to help with interpreting the data and making planning decisions. Co-taught classrooms with paraprofessional for additional support. Grade level planning days. Tutoring offered to the L25 students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

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.

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 and 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.

Progress of African American students monitored through I-Ready diagnostics and instruction will be differentiated accordingly.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Brian Mendler preschool inservice.

Leading and Learning representatives from each grade level.

Get Your Teach On inservice.

I-Ready ongoing training

Curriculum Map and Instructional Guide training/support.

Weekly PLC meetings with each grade level

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

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.

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 and 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.

Progress of African American students monitored through I-Ready diagnostics and instruction will be differentiated accordingly.

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.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: School grade components in alignment with Envision 2030 and K-5 I-Ready.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency from 56% to 65% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Data will be collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as iReady and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
 More exposure to on-grade-level standards.
 Curriculum Map/Instructional Guide Reviews
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students to provide differentiation.
 Continuation of Top Score and implementation in 2nd and 3rd grade.
 Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions/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/enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.
 High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings 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 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.

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 indicated that additional support is needed to improve proficiency and increase rigor in order to maintain proficiency. They plan will be monitored through the actions 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 (Primary Specialist/Dean)
 3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, primary specialist/dean)
 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)

#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 the percent of students demonstrating proficiency from 27% to 33% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Data will be collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
 More exposure to on-grade-level standards.
 Curriculum Map/Instructional Guide Training
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed.
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students to provide differentiation.
 Continuation of Top Score and implementation in 2nd and 3rd grade.
 Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions/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/ enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.
 High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings 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 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.

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 (Primary Specialist/Dean)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, primary specialist/dean)
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 individualized 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)

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

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 47% to 53% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Data will be collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: More exposure to on-grade-level standards.
 Curriculum Map/Instructional Guide Review
 More rigorous formative assessments and centers.
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides will be followed.
 Data analysis and identification of struggling students to provide differentiation.
 Continuation of Top Score and implementation in 2nd and 3rd grade.
 Analysis of I-Ready Diagnostic to plan specific interventions/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/ enrichment is provided effectively and efficiently utilizing all resources.
 High Yield Instruction Strategy Trainings 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 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.

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 (Primary Specialist/Dean)
3. Quarterly I-Ready Diagnostic Data analysis (teachers, Primary Specialist/Dean)
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 individualized 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)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Skyline's overall ranking is #322 for the state of Florida, which is in the Low category. We rank #7 in Lee County for violent incidents (1 student), #1 in Lee County for property incidents (0 students), and #17 in Lee County for Drug/Public Order Incidents (1 student). Skyline ranks 10 out of 27 elementary schools in Lee County. We fall below the state's average. This is due to our PBS behavior plan, supportive behavior response team members, trauma book study, and parent involvement. For those students who need support with behavior choices, interventions are in place. They range from daily check ins, counseling groups, behavior observations, and direct classroom behavior 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.

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. 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 during SAC meetings. Progress toward SIP goals is reviewed at each SAC meeting which allowed stakeholders the opportunity to provide input and ask questions. DAC information is reported to SAC members each quarter which allows all members the opportunity to have input.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Laura Trombetti: 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.

Jill Gurgal: 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.

Renee Fenske: 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.

Jhonathan Taveras: Facilitate and support the integration of technology and assistive technology into the classroom and home to support effective instruction and learning

Stephanie Schmitt: 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.

Amanda Skocik: 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.