
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Doris A. Sanders Learning Center

1201 ENCHANTED DR, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/dslc>

Demographics

Principal: Holly Melton

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Doris A. Sanders Learning Center

1201 ENCHANTED DR, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/dslc>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

To learn, achieve and believe in our potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will communicate effectively, be successful with their educational goals, exhibit universally accepted social behavior, participate in community experiences and contribute positively as a productive member of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bruno, Polly	Principal	<p>The leadership team meets weekly to discuss academic, behavior/discipline, and attendance concerns. The team reviews the data to determine where assistance is needed for behavioral and academic concerns. The team looks at referrals, behavior intervention plans, data to document IEP's, grades and attendance. Our guidance counselor identifies the needs for attendance and holds monthly attendance meetings. The assistance for behavior is provided through our behavior specialist and academic assistance is provided by our curriculum team. Each team member is a grade chair and reports back to their grade level the expectations of curriculum, behavior and attendance policies and procedures.</p>
Driver, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	<p>The leadership team meets weekly to discuss academic, behavior/discipline, and attendance concerns. The team reviews the data to determine where assistance is needed for behavioral and academic concerns. The team looks at referrals, behavior intervention plans, data to document IEP's, grades and attendance. Our guidance counselor identifies the needs for attendance and holds monthly attendance meetings. The assistance for behavior is provided through our behavior specialist and academic assistance is provided by our curriculum team. Each team member is a grade chair and reports back to their grade level the expectations of curriculum, behavior and attendance policies and procedures.</p>
Duque, Giselle	School Counselor	<p>The leadership team meets weekly to discuss academic, behavior/discipline, and attendance concerns. The team reviews the data to determine where assistance is needed for behavioral and academic concerns. The team looks at referrals, behavior intervention plans, data to document IEP's, grades and attendance. Our guidance counselor identifies the needs for attendance and holds monthly attendance meetings. The assistance for behavior is provided through our behavior specialist and academic assistance is provided by our curriculum team. Each team member is a grade chair and reports back to their grade level the expectations of curriculum, behavior and attendance policies and procedures.</p>
Szumlanski, David	Teacher, ESE	<p>Mr. Szumlanski is our behavior interventionist and part of the leadership team. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss academic, behavior/discipline, and attendance concerns. The team reviews the data to determine where assistance is needed for behavioral and academic concerns. The team looks at referrals, behavior intervention plans, data to document IEP's, grades and attendance. Our guidance counselor identifies the needs for attendance and holds monthly attendance meetings. The assistance for behavior is provided through our behavior specialist and academic assistance is provided by our curriculum team. Each team member is a grade chair and reports back to their grade level the expectations of curriculum, behavior and attendance policies and procedures.</p>
LeBlanc, Christina	Other	<p>Speech Therapist The leadership team meets weekly to discuss academic, behavior/discipline, and attendance concerns. The team reviews the data to determine where</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

assistance is needed for behavioral and academic concerns. The team looks at referrals, behavior intervention plans, data to document IEP's, grades and attendance. Our guidance counselor identifies the needs for attendance and holds monthly attendance meetings. The assistance for behavior is provided through our behavior specialist and academic assistance is provided by our curriculum team. Each team member is a grade chair and reports back to their grade level the expectations of curriculum, behavior and attendance policies and procedures.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Holly Melton

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*

School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 .	

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	2	2	4	2	8	7	10	11	4	9	15	4	78
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	1	4	0	5	4	3	5	4	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Monday 6/15/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2	5	3	9	8	7	10	3	9	13	4	11	23	107
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	2	6	5	3	3	4	3	5	0	4	8	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2	5	3	9	8	7	10	3	9	13	4	11	23	107
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	2	6	5	3	3	4	3	5	0	4	8	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	42	50	19	34		5	60			
BLK	27	42		29							

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				9							
WHT	13	44		15	37						
FRL	12	38		16	47						

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	9
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	22
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	23
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

During the school year 2018-2019, our students lowest performing areas were 66% in Math at a Level 1 and 58% in ELA at a Level 1 on the FSAA performance tasks. Our students are cognitively and physically complex which impedes their retention of material.

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

The greatest decline came from one individual student who dropped from a level 4 to a level 3.

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.

Our students are assessed by FSAA.

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

Areas of increase were from both ELA and Math. In ELA, our students increased from .08% to 15% in Level 3 and in Math, our students increased Level 3 from .05% to 14%. The increases were related to a change in standard based instruction with target task alignment.

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

Attendance

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

1. Improvement in Math in all subgroups
2. Improvement in ELA in all subgroups
3. Improvement in attendance in all subgroups
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student engagement is determined by the effective instructional practices delivered by the teacher. Improvement with instructional practices are needed to raise our student achievement. By focusing on target, task alignment with current tested standards, student engagement will improve due to improvement of the instructional practices.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to improve our instructional practices to have an impact on student engagement that will result in an improvement in student achievement based on the 2020-2021 FSAA results in all tested areas. In order for instructional practices to improve, we must monitor the following: the use of target task alignment, standards achievement, student engagement, and utilization of communication via CoreBoard

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathleen Driver (kathleen.driver@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have identified instructional practices as an area of need due to student achievement. The utilization of coaching cycles will be used with teachers to determine their individual area of need and support. Teachers will focus on using evidenced based instructional practices to improve student engagement and achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: During school year 2019-2020, we noticed a lack of student engagement, that lead to further investigate the why? The "why" we feel could be from the instructional practices not being aligned with the appropriate standards and led to disengagement in the classrooms. Knowing effective instructional practices lead to student engagement which will lead to student achievement is a goal for our school.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop professional development plan for teachers to increase their knowledge of instructional practices that improve student engagement and increase student achievement. By utilizing Emily Bouck's "Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild, Moderate and Severe Intellectual Disabilities" Mrs. Driver will lead PD for teachers to increase their instructional practices for student engagement that will lead to student achievement.

Person Responsible Kathleen Driver (kathleen.driver@polk-fl.net)

Identify instructional practices that will result in more student engagement and model and monitor these strategies using a coaching cycle for teachers. Qualitative and quantitative data will be gathered to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices that lead to student engagement through the use of walk-through data, rubrics, student achievement on access point benchmarks for Math and ELA and teacher feedback.

Person Responsible Kathleen Driver (kathleen.driver@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will meet bi-weekly to discuss progress towards the goal of improving student engagement that will result in student achievement.

Person Responsible Kathleen Driver (kathleen.driver@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Area of focus is improving instructional practices that will impact student engagement and therefore improve student achievement. By utilizing our team members expertise each team member will focus in their area:

Mrs. LeBlanc-communication-teachers will receive training on student engagement using communication devices, Mr. Szumlanski will provide training on behavioral strategies as to improve student engagement, Mrs. Duque will provide social skills training in each class room modeling student engagement techniques, Dr. Bruno will provide training on understanding access point benchmarks, and Mrs. Driver will provide professional development on instructional practices that will increase student engagement that will improve student achievement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We have developed unity activities such as our ELA Monthly Multi-Sensory Activities, open to families and community members to participate with their student, Holly Ball, a private community stakeholders provide a Christmas experience for our students, we hosted a Fall Festival and had an adjoining school come over and monitor the craft tables so our students could participate.

Our school leadership team and SAC represent all diverse groups so our students, staff and community will have a say in the leading of our school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$81.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7300	110-Administrators	0092 - Doris A. Sanders Learning Ctr	General Fund		\$81.00

	<i>Notes: Purchase of Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild, Moderate and Severe Disabilities book, to lead PD for teachers</i>	
Total:		\$81.00