

Broward County Public Schools

Lanier James Education Center



2019-20 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	16
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lanier James Education Center

1050 NW 7TH CT, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carletha Shaw Rolle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Broward 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	16
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lanier James Education Center

1050 NW 7TH CT, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 1-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Lanier-James Education Center (LJEC) formerly known as South Area Alternative School is located in the heart of Hallandale Beach, Florida within Broward County Public Schools. Students are placed at Lanier-James by way of the Expulsion Abeyance Program or through the Behavior Intervention Placement Committee. We also serve as the Alternative to External Suspension (AES) site for the southern portion of Broward County. Serving as one of only three behavior centers in the district our goal is to provide students with the social, emotional and behavioral strategies necessary to be successful at their traditional school. There are currently 96 students enrolled at Lanier-James Education Center (12 students Grade 7, 17 students in Grade 8, 19 students in Grade 9, 15 students in grade 10, 22 students in grade 11, and 13 students in grade 12). We have a total of 29 middle schools students and 69 high school students. Of the 96 students, 17 are White (11%), 74 are Black (84%), 2 are Indian (2%), 1 is Asian (1%), and 2 are Multi-racial (2%).

During the 2014-15 school year, Lanier-James transitioned from a K-12 behavior center to 7-12. Our boundaries were also redrawn to encompass all schools south of Sunrise Blvd. We initially serviced schools south of Davie Blvd. With the change in boundaries came a change in the demographic of our student population. We increased the number of at risk students and gained a large portion of students from the schools east of I-95. Challenges were presented in mixing students from "rival" neighborhoods requiring the need for immediate attention to student class scheduling.

Our school social worker and behavior specialist's work together to develop and implement mentoring programs to meet the needs of our student's, through our girl's group Ladies of Distinction the female students are provided the opportunity to hear motivational speakers, and to learn empowerment and self-esteem strategies. Our program T.O.T.A.L. (Touch One Touch All Lives). T.O.T.A.L. is designed to reach all male students by providing mentoring and interventions to be successful at their traditional schools. We also have an ESE specialist and ESE support facilitator providing ESE supports to students and teachers. In addition, our teachers receive support through our literacy coach and math receives their support through the behavior specialist. We also provide educators with weekly professional learning community(PLC) to further their professional growth and development to better service our transient population.

Lanier James is dedicated to safety and educational development of all students. We foster a culture of cooperation and character building to prepare our students to enter society as productive members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Find your work" and "Define your Destiny." All students have the ability to be successful, if provided with the proper support and direction. We are committed to helping our students find their passion and pursue work that is fulfilling financially, socially, and emotionally. We want to strengthen families in order to support student achievement and foster a sense of community citizenship. Finally, we are committed to supporting the SEL-social emotional learning of all our students in order to improve their view of themselves and foster a spirit of cooperation and healthy living by making informed healthy choices.

Lanier-James Education Center is a behavior change center designed to meet the needs of at risk students who have not been successful in the traditional school setting. All students are placed at Lanier-James Education Center through an administrative process. Students are placed into either the Expulsion Abeyance Program or Behavior Modification Program by way of the District's Behavior Intervention Placement Committee for a period of 90 to 180 days. Our goal is to provide our students the

academic and behavioral skills necessary to successfully transition them to their home school upon completion of their designated program.

In addition to the Expulsion Abeyance and Behavior Modification programs, we also offer the Alternative to External Suspension program (AES). Students attending this program are provided the opportunity to participate in an educational setting while completing an external suspension from their assigned school. Students are placed in the AES program for a period of 1 to 10 days.

All Lanier-James students participate in and complete a school level point system. The students in the Behavior Modification Program are required to earn a specific amount of points to be eligible to return to their home school. Student's begin at level one and then move through three additional levels. The point system is as follows: level one 0-325 points, level two 326-1025 points, level three 1026-1675 points and Golden Knight status is 1676 points and above. Students are given point sheets on a daily basis with points being totaled at the end of each week. Their goal is to earn 150 points a week by displaying positive behaviors such as attending class on time, complying with directions for the first time, staying on task and using appropriate language. Students who earn at least 120 points or more each week are provided incentives such as: ice-cream socials, the ability to participate in intramural activities and are entered into gift card drawings.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clemon, Bonnie	Principal	Oversees the total daily operation of the school, liaison between district administration and school community stake holders, and serves as the instructional leader of all learning communities within the school. Other members of the leadership team includes: Dr. Anthony Dorsett; Laura Gruber; LaShawnda Eggelletion; Adrienne Williams; Joycelyn Baskerville; Leslie Baker; Linda A. Walker; and Rita Lawrence.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	24	23	11	17	104	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	65	79	70	64	77	422	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	95	88	83	91	82	517	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	55	88	78	82	41	377	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	83	64	100	100	486	

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	0	78	80	100	83	100	71	512

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	22	30	0	0	0	12	64
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5	17	4	9	6	63

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	83	91	71	92	70	480
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	96	64	95	92	70	508
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	57	46	81	54	10	284
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	94	75	89	60	67	468

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	0	91	96	82	91	92	70	522

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	0%	58%	61%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	51%	56%	0%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	20 (0)	24 (0)	23 (0)	11 (0)	17 (0)	104 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	67 ()	65 ()	79 ()	70 ()	64 ()	77 ()	422 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	78 (0)	95 (0)	88 (0)	83 (0)	91 (0)	82 (0)	517 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33 (0)	55 (0)	88 (0)	78 (0)	82 (0)	41 (0)	377 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	83 (0)	56 (0)	83 (0)	64 (0)	100 (0)	100 (0)	486 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	30%	59%	-29%	56%	-26%
	2018	26%	60%	-34%	58%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
09	2019	36%	57%	-21%	55%	-19%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
10	2019	25%	53%	-28%	53%	-28%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	31%	45%	-14%	46%	-15%
	2018	18%	47%	-29%	45%	-27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	11%	43%	-32%	48%	-37%
	2018	6%	45%	-39%	50%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	67%	-29%	67%	-29%
2018	17%	62%	-45%	65%	-48%
Compare		21%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	6%	71%	-65%	71%	-65%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	67%	-27%	70%	-30%
2018	25%	66%	-41%	68%	-43%
Compare		15%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	61%	-11%	61%	-11%
2018	18%	63%	-45%	62%	-44%
Compare		32%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	19%	56%	-37%	57%	-38%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Compare		19%			

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
FRL											
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
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

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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	
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

91% of 7th graders had 1 more suspensions and 91% of the 7th graders exhibited early warning signs.

Mathematic, Social Studies, Reading and English Language Arts will be the focus for improving student achievement as evidenced by the majority of our students scoring level 1 on FSA ELA and mathematics and not achieving passing scores on Civics and U.S. History EOC's. Teachers will work together during bi-monthly instructional planning meetings to review literacy goals and plan for instruction that encourages students to read across content areas. This is a best practice that will consistently expose students to complex text and build the stamina they need when facing the rigor of FSA and EOC exams. Some contributing factors include lack of student motivation, chronic absenteeism, social emotional instability, poor student communication skills, lack of parental support /involvement, and lack of conflict resolution skills.

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

Math & Reading Proficiency scores declined from previous years. Some contributing factors include lack of student motivation, chronic absenteeism, social emotional instability, poor student communication skills, lack of parental support /involvement, and lack of conflict resolution skills.

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.

Civics EOC had the greatest gap when compared to the state average at -71%. Some contributing factors include lack of student motivation, chronic absenteeism, social emotional instability, poor student communication skills, lack of parental support /involvement, and lack of conflict resolution skills.

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

Algebra 1 EOC showed the most improvement going from -44 differential to a -11 differential. Implementation of a SEL curriculum using LEAPS across the curriculum. This resulted in a decline in student conflicts and a reduction in chronic absenteeism. In addition, students were provided additional support through pull-outs and pop-in sessions in order to support classroom instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Referrals & Chronic Absenteeism
Proficiency in Math, Reading, & Science

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

1. College and Career Readiness - Algebra 1 6
2. College and Career Readiness - Graduation Rate
3. College and Career Readiness - Reading
4. SEL & Positive Behavior
5. Middle Grades Learning - Math & Reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

When students are assigned to Lanier-James Education Center, they are assigned a mentor who is a member of the support staff. The mentor sees their mentees each day when they distribute their daily point sheets to them each morning. The mentor monitors the academic progress and the behavior of each of their mentees.

Academic interventions are provided by classroom teachers for students on an individual basis. The class size makes it possible for students to receive one-on-one instruction and support. Teachers work closely with parents as well as other staff members to provide the needed support. If additional support is needed, the student is referred to the RtI team which will meet and then monitor the student as well as provide additional interventions and/or support as needed by each student.

Individual student data is disaggregated. Student credits are monitored throughout the year. The guidance counselors enroll students who are in need of recovery in recovery courses. Students who are identified as ESE receive additional support via pull-outs and/or push-ins from the ESE specialist and the ESE support facilitators.

Teachers will work together during bi-monthly instructional planning meetings to review literacy and mathematics goals and plan for instruction that encourages students to read across content areas. This is a best practice that will consistently expose students to complex text and build the stamina they need when facing the rigor of FSA and EOC exams.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------