

Duval County Public Schools

# Englewood Elementary School



2019-20 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Englewood Elementary School

4359 SPRING PARK RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

<http://www.duvalschools.org/englewood>

## Demographics

**Principal: Hope Teper**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Englewood Elementary School

4359 SPRING PARK RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

<http://www.duvalschools.org/englewood>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## 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.**

Our Mission Statement:

Englewood Elementary provides students with the proper tools, skills, and experiences that support academic achievement and create opportunities for participation in a global community.

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

Our Vision Statement:

Our students will be prepared, both academically and socially, for the expectations of middle school and be productive participants in their communities and beyond.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mullin, Dino	Principal	
Reshard, Charanda	School Counselor	
Manuel, Meredith	Instructional Coach	
Richardson, Kate	Other	Reading Interventionist
Mercer, Erin	Other	Math Interventionist

### 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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/21/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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	
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

**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	39%	50%	57%	52%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	62%	63%	70%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	63%	62%	67%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	48%	53%	52%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
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)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	49%	-18%	53%	-22%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						

**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	17	41	57	31	52	47	17				
ELL	27	42	42	55	65	48	36				
ASN	43	35		90	89		50				
BLK	38	60		50	41		25				
HSP	28	48	45	53	61	48	50				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	54	56		67	58		36				
FRL	36	54	67	59	61	50	40				

  

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	13	20	15	35	67	50					
ELL	31	43	36	68	68	44	29				
ASN	67	67		86	80						
BLK	43	56	50	70	73	54	72				
HSP	34	35	18	68	65	43	41				
MUL	60			90							

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
WHT	52	38		77	86		45				
FRL	44	46	38	73	73	52	55				
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	33	32	30	33	55	46					
ELL	27	50	60	67	68	62	60				
ASN	45	55		80	91						
BLK	49	63	39	59	53	44	31				
HSP	46	56	70	73	71	70	73				
WHT	63	61		76	76		58				
FRL	49	56	52	66	60	50	47				

**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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

ELA proficiency. The contributing factor would be SWD as their achievement was at 17% and ELL was at 27%. An increase of ESOL students enrolled has resulted in a trend of more students needed to gain or improve their Reading skills.

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

Math proficiency. A factor was that we have varying levels of experience/content knowledge of teachers. Another factor is that we did not have a dedicated math interventionist, which we have this year.

**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.**

The biggest gap was 57% to 39% for math for proficiency. The factors include a drop in proficiency for SWD and ESOL students. Due to needs for personnel support in grades 4 and 5, we noticed a gap in some K-2nd grade students with their proficiency as well.

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

ELA LPQ from 34% to 56%. New actions included teachers identifying students at the beginning of the year. Time was dedicated to progress monitor groups of students. Aligned personnel help for student needs. Phonics for Reading & ACT Now curriculum for ESOL and SWD students was used as well.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

N/A

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

1. ELA learning gains with SWD and ELL
2. Math proficiency
3. Math learning gains with SWD and ELL
4. Strengthening our K-2 program with new programs
5. Improve student attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Reading Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	While ELA gains were made, our Reading proficiency dropped 6% so the goal is to increase the proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students using supplemental programs (e.g. Rosen-Lightsail) to build their comprehension skills.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Utilizing supplemental materials will allow students to have another opportunity to enhance their reading knowledge and show improvement based on students and teachers tracking their data.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Web-Based Training for ELA &amp; VE teachers throughout the year.</li> <li>2. On-Site Professional Development for ELA &amp; VE teachers throughout the year.</li> <li>3. Monitor student progress and intervene accordingly.</li> <li>4. Utilize student data during meetings (e.g. Common Planning) to assess student progress.</li> <li>5. Targeted feedback to individual students to help him/her meet their own learning goal.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)
<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	Math performance has decreased so an increase on instructional strategies will lead to student success
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	75%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers with ACALETICS
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Results based program from pilot schools during the 2018-19 school year. The program will support our students with enriched activities for rigorous content.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic scheduling to allow for correct implementation.</li> <li>2. Teachers will receive in-depth training</li> <li>3. Students will take their baseline assessment</li> <li>4. Teachers will implement the program with fidelity &amp; collaborate with colleagues at PLC</li> <li>5. Admin will monitor and intervene for fidelity</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	In our subgroup, SWD had a percentage of achievement that was 17%. In another subgroup, ELL had a percentage of achievement that was 27%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	SWD would have 35% ELL would have 35%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	All of the new DI programs (e.g. Reading Mastery, Corrective, LLI, Language for Learning) will be implemented. Differentiated groups with flexibility will Teacher will monitor the progress of the students and Admin. will provide support as well.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	District curriculum that is targeted for our school.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Trainings will be provided to teachers 2. Pre-test for each student 3. Data analysis 4. Ongoing assessments 5. Admin monitor and intervene for fidelity
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dino Mullin (mullind1@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

The schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed through ELA as well as Math and Science. Admin will monitor student progress and teacher implementation to help ensure the respective curriculum is being utilized with fidelity. Data will continuously referenced for individual students, groups, grade levels, and our school to help ensure proper action steps are leading to learning achievement for our students.

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**  
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Our school will continue to work with and for families. Communication will continue to be provided to families on a frequent basis from homeroom teachers as well as from Administration. Written communication will continue to be provided to families in their native language.

**PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Our school provides resources for students to help with their needs. We provide school-based supports through Restorative Justice, the Harmony program, one to one counseling with our school counselor, and referrals to the Englewood Full Service program. We continue to work with Big Brothers and Big Sisters for mentoring students.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Our school provides opportunities for prospective Kindergarten students to visit through their respective pre-school during the Spring prior to the upcoming school year. Our school also facilitates meetings with middle school personnel to speak with our 5th grade students in the Spring prior to their upcoming school year as well.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Our School Leadership Team meet on a weekly basis. Part of the meetings involve discussing identified needs for faculty & students then align their needs to any applicable resource that we can provide. Our Team's method is to identify the need, provide ideas, then identify how to supplement a service and/or a program to meet the needs of students.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

na

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>