

The School District of Lee County

The Sanibel School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

The Sanibel School

3840 SANIBEL CAPTIVA RD, Sanibel, FL 33957

<http://sbl.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Lusk

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (81%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Lee 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

The Sanibel School

3840 SANIBEL CAPTIVA RD, Sanibel, FL 33957

<http://sbl.leeschools.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-8	No	20%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	12%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

The mission of The Sanibel School is to provide a world class education, so that students reach their potential through hands-on exploration! We believe what happens here will soon change the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Unite, Inspire, Empower!

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
Reid, Jamie	Principal	The School Leadership Team provides leadership for school, analyzes data, acts as instructional leaders, communicates to stakeholders, and provides support to teachers. Notes from PLC's are turned into administration weekly and shared at School Leadership Meetings. If a team needs more support or training, the Leadership Team provides this for them. We build leadership capacity by allowing our team leaders to run the PLC meetings and administration is there to support them.
Heuck, Michelle	Other	Teacher of gifted students grades K-8. Also, part of the School Leadership Team which meets weekly with other instructional leaders to analyze data, discuss student/school concerns, and collaborate in the school's decision making process. This leader also participates weekly in professional learning community meetings with teachers throughout the school.
Lusk, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Provide leadership for school, analyze data, instructional leader, communicate to stakeholders, provide support to teachers. Part of the School Leadership Team which meets weekly with other instructional leaders to analyze data, discuss student/school concerns, and collaborate in the school's decision making process. Also, the AP develops and monitors and school master schedule and participates weekly in professional learning community meetings with teachers throughout the school.
Sanders, Laurie	Other	K-2 Literacy Coach
Lear, Robin	Teacher, ESE	Oversees students with IEP's or 504's to ensure plans are met with fidelity, assists with meetings and parent support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Jennifer Lusk

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (81%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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

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

Wednesday 10/28/2020

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	24	24	26	33	38	36	36	35	30	0	0	0	0	282
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	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	24	24	26	33	38	36	36	35	30	0	0	0	0	282	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	17	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	

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	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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	89%	62%	61%	93%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	60%	59%	72%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	84%	53%	54%	76%	51%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	90%	62%	62%	90%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	78%	61%	59%	77%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	52%	72%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	87%	54%	56%	70%	45%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	78%	78%	95%	65%	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	
	(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	91%	58%	33%	58%	33%
	2018	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	55%	30%	58%	27%
	2018	91%	53%	38%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	91%	54%	37%	56%	35%
	2018	91%	52%	39%	55%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	84%	52%	32%	54%	30%
	2018	80%	51%	29%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	89%	51%	38%	52%	37%
	2018	91%	50%	41%	51%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	91%	57%	34%	56%	35%
	2018	95%	56%	39%	58%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	61%	30%	62%	29%
	2018	91%	58%	33%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	62%	17%	64%	15%
	2018	92%	58%	34%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	89%	58%	31%	60%	29%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	92%	47%	45%	55%	37%
	2018	43%	41%	2%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		49%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
07	2019	94%	57%	37%	54%	40%
	2018	94%	65%	29%	54%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		51%				
08	2019	100%	60%	40%	46%	54%
	2018	81%	47%	34%	45%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	50%	31%	53%	28%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	87%	46%	41%	48%	39%
	2018	79%	48%	31%	50%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

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	96%	67%	29%	71%	25%
2018	100%	66%	34%	71%	29%
Compare		-4%			
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	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
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	50	80		46	55						
HSP	80	80		90	80						
WHT	89	76	88	90	79	71	88	96	89		
FRL	86	77		83	78	70	67				
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	64	58		60	50						
HSP	81	64		88	86						
WHT	91	74	69	87	60	61	83	100	79		
FRL	82	65	50	81	60	78	67		50		
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	64			55							
HSP	94	71		72	71						

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
WHT	94	73	74	92	78	76	72	97	66		
FRL	85	73	77	80	73	73	36	90	40		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	760
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

Asian Students	
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	83
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	77
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Sixth grade math scores have the highest number of students who are substantially or minimally below. Based on our baseline progress monitoring 65% of sixth grade students are working below grade level proficiency. All teachers are concurrent educators teaching both Face to Face and Lee Home Connect. We are focusing on differentiation to maximize student achievement regardless of service delivery model.

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

Our middle school math scores overall showed the greatest decline. Our students struggled significantly with fourth quarter virtual learning.

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.

All of our scores were significantly above local and state averages but we want to maintain our levels of success and continue to improve student achievement.

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

Eighth grade ELA showed the most maintenance. Only 13 percent of 8th grade ELA students were working below grade level.

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

The biggest areas of concern are differentiation and engagement to meet the needs of all learners regardless if they are face to face or Lee Home Connect.

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

1. Differentiation
2. Engagement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our fifth grade ELA students showed the largest number of substantially or minimally below students with 41% of fifth grade students working below proficiency according to baseline data. This area of concern is a critical area of need based on the fact that this is substantially below the 2019/2020 data provided. Furthermore, this is below the 50% national norm and is a priority of our school wide goals. Proficiency in ELA is not only a necessary component of every subject in middle and high school, but it is also an essential element in nearly every profession. It is essential for this number to improve prior to the start of middle school.
Measurable Outcome:	80% of the Grade 5 students will be proficient (level 3 or higher) on the 2021 ELA FSA. This will be accomplished with Iready pathways and interventions being provided with a targeted approach. Progress monitoring will take place utilizing STAR data and district formatives. IReady pathways will also be continually scrutinized for progress and growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Heuck (michellehe@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Vertical PLC's take place monthly along with weekly PLC's to look at which standards that didn't get covered in face to face instruction during fourth quarter for the 2019-2020 school year. PLC's further dive into formative assessments and progress monitoring that is ongoing, looking for trends and areas to grow. Students will be pulled for interventions when they fall below the 50% targeted benchmark. The students will be placed in a small group setting. Read 180 and other researched based strategies will be provided to ensure the mastery of critical reading and writing skills are achieved.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The vertical PLC provided great discussion on how to close learning gaps from virtual fourth quarter instruction. Differentiated instruction is taking place and it is teacher driven rather than strictly iReady driven. STAR data will also be dissected in teacher PLC's. The team will use data based decision making to drive all instructional and intervention practices.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Measurable Outcome:	90% or more of Algebra students will be proficient (level 3 or higher) on the 2021 Algebra 1 EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:**

80% of the Grade 6 students will make gains on the 2020 Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement**

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership is working on providing professional learning on student engagement and promoting student attendance.

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 are a Leader In Me School. We have professional learning for staff throughout the year, and utilize PBIS to promote positive behavior amongst students. Our counselor is a resource for students who struggle in these areas and cooperative learning supports building relationships in the classroom.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00