

The School District of Lee County

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center

2525 ORTIZ AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://www.leeschools.net/juvenilejustice>

Demographics

Principal: James Buchanan

Start Date for this Principal: 9/22/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center

2525 ORTIZ AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://www.leeschools.net/juvenilejustice>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 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
Grade

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.

Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center is committed to providing an education that allows each student to reach his/her highest potential.)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center's vision is to provide students a quality and comprehensive education that will assist them in their quest to become productive members of our 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buchanon, James	Principal	Monitor school's programs and progress.
Williams, Herman	Administrative Support	
Henderson, Harriett	School Counselor	Supports teachers and students to ensure academic progress.
Portier, Zaida	Administrative Support	Support administration.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/22/2021, James Buchanon

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	4	3	3	1	2	13
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	1	1	1	5

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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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	

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		
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					55%	56%		55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					49%	51%		50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					37%	42%		42%	44%
Math Achievement					50%	51%		54%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					43%	45%		43%	45%
Science Achievement					62%	68%		70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					67%	73%		66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
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

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

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

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

This will be the first year in measuring the percentile gains of students in each level, each sub group and instructional attendance.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students attending Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center are enrolled in school for 15 school days or less, they are required to attend school and the majority of students are level 1. The data does indicate a need to examine the impact of teachers' attendance and students' academic performance as compared to students enrolled in public schools.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Meet with instructional coaches
2. Review the data
3. Identify the students needing assistance
4. Design an individual plan for the students
5. Set aside time for students to receive the individual instructions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Instructor attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During SY' 18-'19 the instructors were absent an average of 20 days excluding in-service and professional development. The average is 23 days if you include in-service and professional development training.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	To increase the amount of certified instructor contact time with students from 213 days to 225 days by the end of June 2020.
----------------------------	--

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
---	---

Evidence-based Strategy:	Negotiate with Teachers Association of Lee County and provide instructors with documented research on the impact of instructors absenteeism on the academic advancement of students.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructors absenteeism will be monitored every 5 days via People Soft and individual meetings will be monitored every 45 days.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with instructors to go over absenteeism
2. Review the data
3. Identify staff absenteeism
4. Design an individual plan for staff attendance
5. Provide incentives for perfect attendance

Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
---------------------------	---

#2. Other specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At least one student per period is removed from the academic setting due to perceived behavioral disruption.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students assigned teachers' generated lock down from 4 per day to 1 per day as measured by DJJ log, by June 2020.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Harriett Henderson (harriettthe@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide Professional Development for all instructors in the area of Social and Emotional Learning. Implement Social and Emotional Learning curriculum in Keyboard class. Provide students' incentives in the form of recognition of success.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:	Progress monitoring will occur bi-weekly via DJJ D-Cell log.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Team training with instructors on social emotional curriculum
2. Develop a behavioral intervention plan to modify behaviors
3. Monthly incentive program with behavioral goals

Person Responsible James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Student Reading Level**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

The majority of students enrolling at Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center are reading 2 or more grade levels below their cohorts.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was .084; eighth graders was 1.21; ninth graders was .12 and tenth graders was .71. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was .75; eighth graders was .97; ninth graders was .44 and tenth graders was 1.10.

Monitoring:**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was .084; eighth graders was 1.21; ninth graders was .12 and tenth graders was .71. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was .75; eighth graders was .97; ninth graders was .44 and tenth graders was 1.10.

**Rationale
for****Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Progress Monitoring will be conducted every 45 days via STAR

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer STAR assessment.
2. Review lesson plans and provide feedback for engaging activities
3. Provide summative assessment to progress monitor

Person**Responsible**

James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

1. Administer STAR assessment.
2. Review lesson plans and provide feedback for engaging activities
3. Provide summative assessment to progress monitor

Person**Responsible**

James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#4. Other specifically relating to Proficient Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although majority of students are Level 1 and 2, Level 3, 4 and 5 students attending need challenging activities provided to continue learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Level 3 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 3 seventh graders was .49; eighth graders was .88; ninth graders was .49 and tenth graders was 1.05.

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide opportunities for differentiated instruction within instruction Provide rigorous materials at various levels

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring will be conducted every 45 days via STAR and formatives every 30 days.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor instruction
2. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs
3. Professional development in differentiated instruction techniques
4. Provide coaching based on classroom observations

Person Responsible James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Math Levels**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The majority of students are below grade level for math.

Measurable Outcome:

Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was 1.17; eighth graders was .25; ninth graders was .32 and tenth graders was .16. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was 1.78; eighth graders was .99; ninth graders was -.06 and tenth graders was .30.

Monitoring:**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provide coaching to assist with tutoring, modeling, small and large group instruction. Provide professional development in Mathematical strategies and curriculum resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress monitoring will be every 45 days via STAR assessment. Formative assessment every 30 days.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs
2. Monitor instruction via lesson plans review and observations
3. Review data from progress monitoring and develop action plans in PLCs

Person Responsible

James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Instructor attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Social and Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Reading Level	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Proficient Students	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Math Levels	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00