

Sarasota County Schools

Sky Academy Englewood



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

Demographics

Principal: John Bailey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Sarasota 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	9%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	26%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bailey, John	Principal	Running the day to day operations of the school and working with the governing board on policies and procedures.
Jaques, Liz	Teacher, K-12	Teaches 6th grade ELA and is part of the school leadership team.
Shea, Natalia	Assistant Principal	Helps run the day to day operations of the school with a primary focus on student discipline and testing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, John Bailey

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.*

6

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

260

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

6

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

8

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	91	76	0	0	0	0	259	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	12	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	13	0	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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 9/27/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	82	100	0	0	0	0	267	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	18	

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	11

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	82	100	0	0	0	0	267	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	18	

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	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 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				61%	64%	54%	66%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	58%	54%	61%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	47%	61%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				73%	74%	58%	71%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains				63%	66%	57%	66%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	56%	51%	73%	61%	51%
Science Achievement				51%	61%	51%	51%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	85%	72%	80%	78%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	62%	66%	-4%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	58%	73%	-15%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	88%	65%	23%	46%	42%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	48%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	85%	-3%	71%	11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We use I-Ready and IXL in math and ELA. For civics, algebra, geometry, and science we use the school districts benchmark assessments.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			76
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	52	71
	Students With Disabilities			29
	English Language Learners			33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			68
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	62	64
	Students With Disabilities			43
	English Language Learners			0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			50
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			58
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			60
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			56
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			30
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			76
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			40
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			46
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

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	11	28	21	26	52	50		25			
ELL				50	10						
HSP	51	41	31	59	45	31	50	92			
MUL	54	42		75	36						
WHT	59	54	26	71	56	63	42	71	55		
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	41	40	38	47	53					
HSP	69	46		62	48						
WHT	61	52	51	75	65	62	53	83	84		
FRL	56	51	52	57	47	27					

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	32	57	63	42	68	93					
HSP	46	54		64	73						
WHT	67	61	62	71	66	74	50	80	87		
FRL	37	37	55	46	63						

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	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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
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	55
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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?

SWD students are showing lower learning gains throughout all categories.

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

Subgroups for SWD achievement levels for ELA and math proficiency are the lowest performing category across all Assessment data.

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

The school had an increased number of students identified as SWD and needed to add additional instructional supports for the students. The school has added additional staff to focus on these areas.

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

Cohort increase in mathematics proficiency from grade 7 to grade 8 was 32% in 2019. This is the result of strong instruction aligned to pacing guides and progress monitored throughout the year with the use of I-ready diagnostics.

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

Cohort increase in mathematics proficiency from grade 7 to grade 8 was 32% in 2019. This is the result of strong instruction aligned to pacing guides and progress monitored throughout the year with the use of I-ready diagnostics.

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

Students that are eligible to be in accelerated classes such as Algebra and Geometry will be given the appropriate opportunity.

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.

The staff members teaching accelerated and gifted classes will be completing or working towards completed their gifted certification.

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

For the 2021-22 school year an additional staff position focused on intensive math has been added. The school also now has a full time ESE liaison and school counselor. This position previous has been shared and now is separate. This will lead to greater student and staff support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students from the school year 2021 had a proficiency rate of 55% in ELA. This represented a drop from the previous years state assessment scores.
Measurable Outcome:	SKY Academy Englewood will increase their proficiency rate on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA from 55% to 65%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will take place through I-Ready diagnostics and routine classroom observations and assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of an Intensive ELA Class to support additional instruction for low performing students. Progress monitoring will be completed on a quarterly basis through the use of i-ready.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are not performing at a proficient level on state assessments need additional time to address gaps in learning as well as support in ongrade level instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review reporting categories for gaps in learning
2. Schedule students for daily intensive ELA class\
3. Progress monitor using I-ready and IXL
4. Develop an individualized learning plan to support individual students according to their unique gaps.

Person Responsible Liz Jaques (elizabeth.jaques@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need to be in school in order to be successful in achieving academic gains.
Measurable Outcome:	SKY Academy Englewood will maintain the number of students who have less than 90% attendance rates.
Monitoring:	Attendance reports will be run by the school registrar.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a monitoring program through the homeroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who have adults on the campus who care for them and monitor their attendance are more likely to be addressed as the attendance issues arise.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor attendance rate on a bi-weekly basis via homeroom teachers
2. Mail home attendance notices for students accruing excessive absences
3. Parent contact/conference for students accruing more than 10 absences in a term
4. Student referrals to School Wide Support Team (SWST) to establish an action plan for student
5. Progress monitor action plan with updated parent contact as needed

Person Responsible Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving the learning gains for the lowest quartile students is vital to the success of the student and the school.
Measurable Outcome:	Sky Academy Englewood will increase the percentage of lowest quartile students who make learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Mathematics from 55% to 62%.
Monitoring:	Teachers and administrators will monitor I-Ready diagnostic results, IXL modules, and classroom assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IXL and I-Ready diagnostic, progress monitoring and intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will utilize the i-ready and IXL programs for diagnostic and intervention purposes. Program will identify areas of weaknesses and target instructional pathways along the different reporting categories.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students take i-ready diagnostics
2. Students conference with their teachers and set goals
3. A learning pathway is developed for each student to address gaps in learning
4. Teacher monitors progress on a bi-weekly basis
5. Follow up progress monitoring through i-ready will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth
6. Student pathway is redefined at each window.

Person Responsible Natalia Shea (natalia.shea@skyatthey.com)

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.

Data for SKY Academy Englewood was not available on SafeSchoolsforAlex. The primary focus for the school will be creating a positive culture. This will lead to reduced incidents of alleged bullying and student conflict.

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.

SKY is in the development stage of a new PBIS program focused around the positive actions of the students in our school. This incentive program will recognize student for exhibiting qualities within the seven wellnesses. Instruction on the meanings behind the wellnesses and how they impact our daily lives occurs within homeroom settings on a weekly basis.

Homeroom time built into the schedule to address SEL curriculum needs and aligned to SKY Academy's 7 wellnesses: Social, Occupational, Spiritual, Physical, Intellectual, Emotional and Environmental.

Guidance is in its third year on the campus to address student needs as individuals.

Anonymous reporting apps (Fortify Florida) have added to the school for students to report incidents of bullying, social concerns, safety and threats. Teambuilding and collective collaboration activities are implemented in instruction when appropriate. New groups / Lunch Bunches are held with groups of students focused on specific topics (grief, social skills, communication, etc).

Aftercare program developed to include more interactive opportunities for students to socialize appropriately through games and activities.

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

The school has developed a PBIS committee which is responsible for planning, administering, and analyzing the PBIS program. We will collect data and track student behavior and create a plan for rewarding positive student choices. The PBIS committee is comprised of the ESE liaison, school counselor, subject matter classroom teachers, and administrators. The PBIS committee meets on a monthly basis.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00