

Alachua County Public Schools

# Sidney Lanier Center



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Sidney Lanier Center

312 NW 16TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32601

<https://www.sbac.edu/lanier>

### Demographics

**Principal: Royce Kamman G**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

### 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](http://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.**

Sidney Lanier School will ensure that students with disabilities learn authentic skills in a safe environment to be productive and integrated into their home, community, leisure and work.

The Alachua County School Districts' mission statement:  
We are Committed to the Success of Every Student!

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

We believe...

...That all students with disabilities can reach their highest possible standard of achievement.

...That students with disabilities can become contributing members of our community.

...That special education programs will reflect only the finest in research-based practices.

...That ongoing staff development will focus on the refinement of instructional practices that reflect the unique needs of our students.

...That all special education activities will be meaningful, authentic, and engaging for our students.

...That all Sidney Lanier Special Educators will be a model of excellence in their field.

The Vision Statement for The Alachua County School District is:

We will graduate students who have the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics to be learners and independent thinkers. Our graduates will excel in their chosen careers and be productive and contributing members of the global community.

### 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
Kamman, Royce	Principal	coordinate and facilitate the implementation of resources, implementation of programming and guide the process. Institute progress monitoring of new and established programs. Provide dialogue and collect feedback.
Dotts-Hoehnle, Kim	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and resource development, collection of data relative to academic and behavioral interventions and observations.
Sauberan, Lisa	Dean	-behavior intervention, resource development, data relative to behavior, intervention strategies, observations.
Williams, Bailey	Dean	behavior intervention, resource development, data relative to behavior, intervention strategies, observations.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/3/2020, Royce Kamman G

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

31

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes

<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I

**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	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4	6	4	4	53	83
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	5	4	0	0	4	1	10	2	2	29
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	7	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	18
	0	2	3	4	26	33	5	6	8	10	15	7	57	176
	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	1	0	2	10	8	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	25

**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	0	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 6/30/2020

**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	2	8	13	9	13	3	7	7	8	10	12	71	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	9	2	4	2	3	0	0	1	2	7	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	8	4	10	1	1	1	1	0	1	4	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	4	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	20

**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	2	8	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	2	8	13	9	13	3	7	7	8	10	12	71	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	9	2	4	2	3	0	0	1	2	7	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	8	4	10	1	1	1	1	0	1	4	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	4	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	20

**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	2	8	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	65%	61%	0%	61%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	54%	0%	46%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	59%	59%	0%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	50%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	60%	56%	0%	65%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	84%	78%	0%	76%	77%

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

**Grade Level Data**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	8%	55%	-47%	58%	-50%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	8%	55%	-47%	56%	-48%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	54%	-54%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	60%	-60%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
	2018	8%	60%	-52%	62%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
07	2019	0%	59%	-59%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018	0%	24%	-24%	45%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	54%	-54%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	68%	-68%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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 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	12
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	70
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	90%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	16
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	9
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	13
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.**

The ELA component of the testing cycle has shown low scores. The Math component for the previous testing cycle is strikingly low. This low performance is related to the influx of new students who are assigned throughout the course of the year. Students in our programs are sent to us from various district schools.

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

Math. This performance is directly attributed to the varied times that students are placed with us. We receive students throughout the year and work on behavior and academics. Our IND population is varied and are ACCESS point curriculum students.

#### **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 and ELA. This performance is directly attributed to the varied times that students are placed with us. We receive students throughout the year and work on behavior and academics. Our IND population is varied and are ACCESS point curriculum students.

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

In our ELA we maintained our scores from the previous year. In Math we dropped significantly.

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

Both ELA and Math are concerns

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

1. Math skills for our four sub categories, Black/African American students. Economically disadvantaged students. Students with Disabilities and White students.
2. ELA skills for our four sub categories, Black/African American students. Economically disadvantaged students. Students with Disabilities and White students.
3. Continue the reduction of OSS for Our four sub categories Black/African American

students. Economically disadvantaged students. Students with Disabilities and White students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We will set a goal to increase performance by 3% and use data collected from assessments to drive curriculum and provide supports to increase ELA learning gains.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	We will set a goal to increase performance by 3% and use data collected from assessments to drive curriculum and provide supports to increase ELA learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Monique Moss (mossmm@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Some of the evidence based strategies will include: Frequent progress monitoring, re-teaching and remediation, data chats small group instruction and interventions and Title I FCIM pullout to supplement ELA.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	ELA skills for our four sub categories are priorities. we will use supplemental elements for our regular curriculum. We will use iStation and IXL as a data collection tool to track progress. Our IND population will use Unique and N2Y as assessment tools to collect and track progress. We will use progress monitoring to assess monthly data.

#### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The area of focus this year will be Math. With the number of new students we have throughout the course of the year maintaining data is key. For our FSA students we will use iStation and IXL as a data collection tool to track progress. Our IND population will use Unique and N2Y as assessment tools to collect and track progress. We will use progress monitoring to assess monthly data.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will set a goal to increase performance by 3% and use data collected from assessments to drive curriculum and provide supports to increase Math learning gains.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Monique Moss (mossmm@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Some of the evidence based strategies will include: Frequent progress monitoring, re-teaching and remediation, data chats small group instruction and interventions and Title I FCIM pullout to supplement Math.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Math skills for our four sub categories are priorities. we will use supplemental elements for our regular curriculum. We will use iStation and IXL as a data collection tool to track progress. Our IND population will use Unique and N2Y as assessment tools to collect and track progress. We will use progress monitoring to assess monthly data.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*



**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Title 1 FCIM coordinator to work on pull out classroom to target, implement and provide support in ESSA subgroup deficient in ELA and Math.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	We will set a goal to increase performance by 3% and use data collected form assessments to drive curriculum and provide supports to increase ELA and Math learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Royce Kamman (kammanrg@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Explicit communication of high expectations for all students, engagement of all students in challenging anf standards based curriculum, strategies to build faculty collective efficacy, increase faculty's cultural competency. Reaching out to parents through Title I Parent Family outreach and implementing strategies that instruct diverse learners.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	ELA and Math skills for our four sub categories are priorities. we will use supplemental elements for our regular curriculum. We will use iStation and IXL as a data collection tool to track progress. Our IND population will use Unique and N2Y as assessment tools to collect and track progress. We will use progress monitoring to assess monthly data

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To look for alternative s to OSS for all non-violent infractions. Track the OSS data for SWD and AA Students daily.

**Measureable Outcome:** To monitor and address students of concern with the Student Services Team. We will use progress monitoring of data and hold weekly meetings with our SS team. We will use discipline data to identify areas of concern. Stick with the school plan to use data and drive decisions based on data and review and adjust as we move forward.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Bailey Williams (williamsbb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use the Zones of Regulation and take advantage of our guidance and mental health counselors. Staff will continue to train on Trauma Informed Care. Our Behavior Resource Teacher and Dean will work with teachers to develop classroom strategies and man the Re-Start Room for students having difficulties.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We are committed to working with our population of students to create an environment where students have a safe place to go. This includes alternative structures where students can advocate for themselves.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	To look for alternative s to OSS for all non-violent infractions. Track the OSS data for SWD and AA Students daily. We also will work to involve parents in the decision making process for their child's progress and support.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	To monitor and address students of concern with the Student Services Team. We will use progress monitoring of data and hold weekly meetings with our SS team. We will use discipline data to identify areas of concern. Stick with the school plan to use data and drive decisions based on data and review and adjust as we move forward. Parent communication will be through daily check sheets, e-mail and phone homes.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Sauberan (sauberanlm@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will use the Zones of Regulation and take advantage of our guidance and mental health counselors. Staff will continue to train on Trauma Informed Care. Our Behavior Resource Teacher and Dean will work with teachers to develop classroom strategies and man the Re-Start Room for students having difficulties.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We are committed to working with our population of students to create an environment where students have a safe place to go. This includes alternative structures where students can advocate for themselves.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	To look for alternative s to OSS for all non-violent infractions. Track the OSS data for SWD and AA Students daily.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	To monitor and address students of concern with the Student Services Team. We will use progress monitoring of data and hold weekly meetings with our SS team. We will use discipline data to identify areas of concern. Stick with the school plan to use data and drive decisions based on data and review and adjust as we move forward.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kim Dotts-Hoehnle (kimdh@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will use the Zones of Regulation and take advantage of our guidance and mental health counselors. Staff will continue to train on Trauma Informed Care. Our Behavior Resource Teacher and Dean will work with teachers to develop classroom strategies and man the Re-Start Room for students having difficulties.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We are committed to working with our population of students to create an environment where students have a safe place to go. This includes alternative structures where students can advocate for themselves.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	To identify key parents and network to create an environment where parents and guardians are a large part of the school support system.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	To increase parent involvement by 25% for the 20-21 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Monique Moss (mossmm@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using the Parent Family structure, we can measure the number of involved families through active and digital participation.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The increase in parent involvement can assist real school change and help bridge the gap in learning gains.

**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.

**Our student services team will meet weekly to discuss students of concern and monitor all programs realrted to the schools needs assessment. This team will support the school plan and address strategies and expectations of the school wide plan.**

## 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 teach parents and staff to understand ELA and help them to develop a better understanding of students who have difficulties related to ELA.

Goal: They will be able to effectively provide support to assist the students schoolwide

We will teach parents to understand Math and help them to develop a better understanding of students who have difficulties related to learning math.

Goal: They will be able to effectively provide support to assist the students schoolwide

### 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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$14,286.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provision of through the renewal and use of Unique and N2Y for our students with profound disabilities.</i>			

	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$3,286.00
			<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 web-based program</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Starfall web-based program</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$700.00
			<i>Notes: Lesson Pix program</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$2,636.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase and implementation of Reflex Math</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American</b>				<b>\$60,637.92</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$60,637.92
			<i>Notes: Instructional Intervention Coach and Intervention Teacher to provide pull out option for ESSA subgroup students deficient in ELA .</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Equity &amp; Diversity</b>				<b>\$2,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	General Fund		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Will use fundraisers and business partners to support PBIS initiatives,</i>			
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Discipline</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: We will solicit out business partners to assist in supporting our PBIS program and supports.</i>			
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$4,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Touch Chat for our digital devices. This will assist in communication for non-verbal students.</i>			
<b>7</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Parent Involvement</b>				<b>\$1,960.32</b>

Alachua - 0081 - Sidney Lanier Center - 2020-21 SIP

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0081 - Sidney Lanier Center	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.32
			<i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$86,020.24</b>