

Clay County Schools

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center



2020-21 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://blc.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Palmer

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Clay 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://blc.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK, 6-12	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	2012-13
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Bannerman Learning Center's mission is to create a positive, safe and supportive environment that promotes excellence in teaching and learning. The unique potential of each individual is recognized and encouraged in a challenging and diverse setting. Through the growth and advancement of students and staff, knowledge and skills are gained to meet life's challenges and develop active, responsible citizens for our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bannerman Learning Center exists to prepare all students to be successful in a positive manner in a competitive workplace and community. Students will thrive in a safe and welcoming environment, foster mutual respect between students and staff while focusing on returning to their home school or preparing to enlist in the military, enroll in college or become gainfully employed.

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
Mckinney, Mark	Principal	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs while providing professional development for staff that fosters growth in PBIS, SEL programs, and raising the academic expectations of students, faculty and staff.
Cox, Brian	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in all aspects of instruction and operation of school functions.
Flagg, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	As ESE Support Facilitator, Ms. Flagg will support both specialized instruction and the implementation of differentiated instruction for all students regardless of their ESE status. She will also serve in a leadership role in support of the principal and assistant principal related to school improvement planning and delivery, as well as oversee school-wide initiatives such as SEL programming.
McKenzie, Erin	Teacher, ESE	As Behavior Management Teacher, Ms. McKenzie will assist school-wide initiatives related to student engagement, discipline, and classroom behavior management.
Johnson, Spencer	Dean	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/20/2020, Stephanie Palmer

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	14	28	48	95	216
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	27	30	47	83	223
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	8	16	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	18	35	43	119

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	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	27	30	47	83	223
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	8	16	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	18	35	43	119

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	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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%	57%	61%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	52%	62%	0%	47%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	59%	0%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	52%	0%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	56%	0%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	5%	59%	-54%	52%	-47%
	2018	6%	54%	-48%	51%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	22%	62%	-40%	56%	-34%
	2018	20%	67%	-47%	58%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
09	2019	19%	61%	-42%	55%	-36%
	2018	10%	56%	-46%	53%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	2%	57%	-55%	53%	-51%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	13%	58%	-45%	53%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	10%	70%	-60%	55%	-45%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	14%	63%	-49%	54%	-40%
	2018	5%	58%	-53%	54%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	10%	49%	-39%	46%	-36%
	2018	6%	52%	-46%	45%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	10%	64%	-54%	48%	-38%
	2018	17%	67%	-50%	50%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	72%	-68%	67%	-63%
2018	0%	90%	-90%	65%	-65%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	80%	-66%	71%	-57%
2018	13%	78%	-65%	71%	-58%
Compare		1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	80%	-51%	70%	-41%
2018	13%	78%	-65%	68%	-55%
Compare		16%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	65%	-61%	61%	-57%
2018	5%	66%	-61%	62%	-57%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	64%	-57%	57%	-50%
2018	17%	61%	-44%	56%	-39%
Compare		-10%			

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	22	29		17	36		20	29		28	
BLK	6	36					10			38	
WHT	19	33		14	25		15	27		30	18
FRL	13	29		21	20		14	21		22	
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	22	29		17	36		20	29		28	
BLK	6	36					10			38	
WHT	19	33		14	25		15	27		30	18
FRL	13	29		21	20		14	21		22	
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	29		17	36		20	29		28	
BLK	6	36					10			38	
WHT	19	33		14	25		15	27		30	18
FRL	13	29		21	20		14	21		22	

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	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	169
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	80%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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 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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0

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	23
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	20
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.

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance last year. The nature of our school population means the students come to this school at risk for failure. Having better communication between schools should allow this component to show greater success.

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

Science achievement declined by 4%. This area has seen teacher turn over in consecutive years and we only have 1 high school science teacher. Increased expectations should help student take more ownership and have an more active role in their educational outcomes.

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.

Math achievement had the greatest gap (-10%) when compared to the state average. Our population of students has turned over at an increasing rate. We have implemented iReady for the Junior high math courses which is a great tool for remediation.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement from last year with a gain of 10%. Our increased engagement and implementation of a successful Achieve 3000 and IReady programs has help our numbers increase.

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

Discipline and Attendance continue to be an areas of concern. Most of our students arrive behind in credits with a low GPA which is a symptom of attendance and discipline issues. Increased engagement and having high expectations for all learners is key to turn these students towards success.

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

1. Raising student expectations
2. Increasing student engagement
3. Showing Enthusiasm
4. consistent opportunities for grade-appropriate assignments
5. Providing Strong instructions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we support teachers in the development of instructional strategies specific to the at risk nature of our student population, and provide for them the tools and ideas to increase student engagement, we will see better student outcomes on state assessments, and improved teacher efficacy.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of students will demonstrate learning gains on the FSA ELA.
50% of students will demonstrate learning gains on the Algebra 1 EOC and/or the Geometry EOC...

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mark Mckinney (william.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will use text annotation to make meaning and provide evidence to support answers.
Teachers will use read-discuss-read protocol in both ELS and Intensive Reading classes. Content level teachers will encourage pre-writing and pre-reading strategies and utilize Cornell note-taking.
Students will be encouraged to immerse themselves in content-rich grade level text. 11th and 12th grade students are presented opportunities to meet concordant scores through extensive ACT, SAT, and PSAT preparation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All strategies are evidence-based and provide opportunities for high levels of student engagement. Teachers will have the opportunity to provide TIER 2 and TIER 3 interventions with support from the literacy team, administration and Support Facilitator.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create an Literacy Action Team.
2. Schoolwide reading initiative using IReady and Achieve.
3. Evaluation of strategies in professional learning communities.
4. Common planning to monitor standards.
5. Coaching provided by district specialists.

Person Responsible Mark Mckinney (william.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There was a spike in our referral rate last year; students should not be missing class because of discipline this takes away from their education. If we can change the mindset of students with overcoming obstacles we can increase student engagement and enhance their educational experience. Implementation of the our Social Emotional Learning. This program will increase self awareness and will result in a more positive school atmosphere.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce the referral rate by 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Incentive Programs, PBIS point system which allows students to buy items form the school store. Social Emotional Learning training for students and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Incentive Programs encourage positive behaviors by rewarding students for improved and appropriate behaviors. We will achieve this goal if we decrease referral rate by 25% from last year

Action Steps to Implement

1. Explain PBIS (Indian Bucks) to faculty and students.
2. Continue to create community partners to help assist with School based projects.t
3. Recognize students for positive behaviors.
4. Students and teachers are participating in SEL during Bison Mindsets to address overcoming obstacles and changing their mindset.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Academic Leadership will focus on teachers common planning and addressing the students needs.

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 will be using the Social and Emotional Learning/Character education (7 Mindsets) during Bison Mindset time everyday to meet the social-emotional needs of all students. Counseling and mentoring will be provided when needed. The community partnership schools group will also help provide students with resources outside of school to help with decision making and social emotional needs. We will recognize students of the week from all of the programs on campus.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00