

Broward County Public Schools

Lanier James Education Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

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
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)	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
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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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 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.

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. 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.

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
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.
Mitchell , Eddie	SAC Member	SAC & SIP Chair responsible for organizing SAC meetings, development of the school improvement plan, and administration of school improvement funds.
Dorset, Anthony	Assistant Principal	In charge of building maintenance, professional development, discipline, RTI, and support
Baker, Leslie	Dean	In charge of school discipline referrals and behavioral support
Baskerville, Joycelyn	Attendance/ Social Work	In charge of truancy, chronic absenteeism, parent & community engagement
Castro, Laura	Attendance/ Social Work	In charge of truancy, chronic absenteeism, parent & community engagement
Eggelletion-Buckner, Lashawnda	Instructional Coach	In charge of school-wide literacy and support
Gruber, Laura	Teacher, ESE	In charge of ESE/504 support facilitations, IEP, RTI, and ESE intake
Johnson, Kregg	Dean	In charge of school discipline referrals and behavioral support
Lawrence-Reyes, Rita	School Counselor	In charge of scheduling, student advisement, testing, and developing guidance plans
Walker, Linda	Administrative Support	In charge of Alternative to External Suspension (AES) program.
Williams, Adrienne	School Counselor	In charge of scheduling, student advisement, testing, graduation, retention, grade level matriculation, and developing guidance plans

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Carletha Shaw Rolle

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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)	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
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 .	

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	12	17	19	29	22	18	117
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	14	18	18	16	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	18	18	11	10	82
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	13	5	8	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	4	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	1	1	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	14	17	12	13	77

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	8	13	14	17	12	13	77

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	1	7	0	0	0	4	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	1	1	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	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

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	10	20	26	24	16	18	114
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	21	17	8	13	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	23	20	15	15	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	22	18	12	7	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	8	7	0	0	31

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	7	16	25	20	13	12	93

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	6	0	0	0	5	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	1	1	10

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	
	(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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
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					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	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 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	1

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.

88% of 9th graders had 1 or more suspensions and 96% of 9th graders exhibited two or more early warning signs. Mathematics, 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. In addition, our students did not achieve passing scores on the Algebra, Biology, Geometry EOCs. Teachers will work together during b-monthly instructional planning meetings to review literacy goals and plan for instruction that encourages students to read across content areas. The best practice 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, lack of conflict resolution skills, transitioning to eLearning, and the destabilizing effects of COVID-19 pandemic.

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, lack of conflict resolution skills, and interruption of routines by the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 -65%. 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 to a -11 differential. Implementation of a SEL curriculum, blended learning, robotics initiative, increase parental involvement, and school-wide incentives were contributing factors. Moreover, this resulted in a decline in the student conflicts and a reduction in chronic absenteeism across this subgroup. Furthermore, students were provided additional support through pull-out and pop-in sessions which supported classroom instruction.

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

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Parental involvement is tied to student success in school and attendance. In supporting our students and their families through skills training this will improve the relationship between parent, students, and school. As a result students will have a positive outlook of school that should improve involvement and attendance.

Measurable Outcome: This program should reduce the number of behavioral referrals by 20% from the previous year as determined by information from the Basis Behavior dashboard.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bonnie Clemon (bonnie.clemon@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Family strengthening programs are researched based programs that have been shown to improve relationships between student, parent, and school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected to improve student parent relationships and to improve parental involvement in the academic pursuits of their children. This strategy has also be successful in allowing families to develop positive ways to communicate and reduce family conflicts while strengthening the familial unit.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify at risk families and students
2. Provide support and skills training to both student and parents
3. Allow families to collaborate with trained group leaders to improve communication and build relationships

Person Responsible Eddie Mitchell (eddie.mitchell@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students will engage in project based learning and STEAM initiatives centered around building 21st century skills and digital preparedness. The rationale behind this initiative is to build Mathematics and Science through STEAM hands-on minds-on learning.

Measurable Outcome: Students Math and science scores will increase by 20% has measured by the Algebra EOC, Biology EOC, and FSA science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bonnie Clemon (bonnie.clemon@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBL is an evidenced based strategy that promotes science and math learning in all students through hands on experiential training.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The was selected due to the positive outcomes associated with project based learning and STEAM programs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify subgroups with challenges in Math & Science
2. Institute robotics and STEAM projects to improve engagement
3. Follow up activities and feedback to improve experience

Person Responsible Eddie Mitchell (eddie.mitchell@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address behavioral referrals, chronic absenteeism, lack of proficiency in math, reading, and science by providing frequent and continuous support to our students as they enter our school.

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 proteges 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 proteges.

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 Rtl 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 received additional support via pull-outs and/or push-ins from the ESE specialist and the ESE support facilitators. Teachers will work together during the 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. In addition, we will offer robotics, i-Ready, USA test prep, school-wide literacy, establishing classroom libraries to support reading and literacy, CHAMPS to support eLearning, Family Strengthening Programs to encourage community involvement, Team building as well as community building activities, technological resources, family counseling, and offer SEL programs to support our students socio-emotional learning 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.

Parental involvement is a cornerstone for student success and a top priority for our school. Our parents are contacted regularly about upcoming events and ways to get involved in our schools. We continuously and regularly reach out to parents through our SAC and SAF committees to increase their involvement in our school. We also use our website, email, and leverage web 2.0 resources such as Remind, Facebook and Instagram to regularly communicate our parents so they are aware of ways they can get involved in their

children's education and become a vital part of our school. We also have developed a family strengthening program that will provide support for our parents, students, and community by providing skills that improve family relationship and communication. Furthermore, have two school social workers, one family counselor, and one equity and diversity liaison that will provide additional support to our families, if needed.

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: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$12,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200		0405 - Lanier James Education Center	School Improvement Funds		\$12,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funding for school-based or virtual Family Strengthening Program initiative.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200		0405 - Lanier James Education Center	School Improvement Funds		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funding for Robotics and Drone initiatives.</i>			
					Total:	\$22,000.00