Orange County Public Schools

Hospital Homebound

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 6

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 16

Budget to Support Goals 17

Hospital Homebound

12301 WARRIOR RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://ocps.net/cms/one.aspx?portalid=54703&pageid=90565

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Theis

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 16

Budget to Support Goals 17

Hospital Homebound

12301 WARRIOR RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://ocps.net/cms/one.aspx?portalid=54703&pageid=90565

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

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
Theis, Elizabeth	Principal	Dr. Elizabeth Theis serves as principal and maintains a balanced focus on safety/community combined with the use of standards-based instruction, Marzano's Instructional Framework and data-based decision making; models the problem solving process; develops a culture of high expectations and high quality instruction with the school staff; oversees the implementation of best practices associated with the DPLC. The focus of the Hospital/Homebound also considers the medical and/or psychiatric needs of the students, while attending to the academic needs of the students.
Josephs Richardson, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Dr. Sharon Williams serves as the assistant principal and assists the principal in providing a common vision of standards based instruction and of data-based decision-making; coordinates the implementation of intervention support, data analysis, and progress monitoring. Dr. Josephs Richardson is the primary contact for creating, maintaining, and modifying student schedules.
Troupe, Sonia	Dean	Ms. Troupe coordinates the Induction Program and supports all teachers through coaching and classroom walkthroughs. She is a member of the DPLC Team, and she coordinates testing for elementary and middle school students.
Phillips, Suzanne	Instructional Coach	Ms. Phillips supports the 1:1 teachers who provide instruction for our students who take the FSAA. She also coordinates the testing for this group of students. She is a member of our DPLC team and supports teachers with best practices in literacy.

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	4	7	5	7	7	5	7	10	16	9	3	10	10	100
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4	1	2	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	5	4	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	1	6	5	5	7	4	6	4	1	45

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	6	7	5	7	0	8	14	22	31	21	16	20	11	168

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	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/10/2019

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	
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	

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	

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%	62%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	81%	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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	4 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	16 (0)	9 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)	10 (0)	100 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	5 ()	3 ()	4 ()	1 ()	2 ()	0 ()	17 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	22 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	45 (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	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	40%	48%	-8%	52%	-12%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				
08	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
09	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
	2018	9%	50%	-41%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
10	2019	27%	50%	-23%	53%	-26%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	63%	-63%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	43%	-43%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	35%	-35%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	15%	36%	-21%	46%	-31%
	2018	25%	32%	-7%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	27%	49%	-22%	48%	-21%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	60%	67%	-7%	67%	-7%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		60%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	66%	7%	71%	2%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	71%	-71%
Compare		73%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	35%	61%	-26%	62%	-27%
Compare		-35%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	27	52		26	35		16				
HSP	25	64		29							
WHT	45			42							
FRL	30										

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	185
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	88%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	44
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	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Both ELA and Math are both showing low performance. 29% of all students showed proficiency in Math, whereas 38% of the students showed proficiency in ELA. Both areas are below expectation, and will be addressed.

30% of the ED subgroup scored at the proficient level, and 31% of SWD scored at the proficient level.

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

Math declined slightly from the prior year. As a PK-12th grade program with students who transition frequently or are VERY ill, the decline was not surprising.

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 showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Many of the students are newly enrolled this year, and many are very ill and medically fragile, contributing to this gap.

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

ELA showed modest improvement. We began working in collaborative teams and we implemented best practices in literacy with a school-wide focus on text dependent questions and close reading.

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

Our attendance data is an underestimate of attendance because many students in Hospital Homebound receive instruction for 1-2 hours per week. Although families try to schedule appointments around their scheduled instructional sessions, students miss instruction frequently, impacting their school and achievement performance. Student absences also affect course progression and failure. Attendance and participation remain our primary concerns.

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

1. Performance on FSA
2. Performance on FSAA
3. Attendance/participation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Performance on FSA
Rationale	This year, Hospital Homebound received a Maintaining rating on the School Improvement Rating. The students who are eligible for Hospital Homebound services are expected to be absent from school at least 15 days. The majority of the students are enrolled for significantly longer periods. Students either have acute, chronic, life threatening or terminal illnesses or injuries that significantly impact school performance. 29% of the students tested showed proficiency on Math, and 38% showed proficiency in ELA. Our challenge is to support students' learning while experiencing severe illness and treatment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 41% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA-Math and ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alicia Josephs Richardson (alicia.josephsrichardson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will be focusing more deliberately on standards-based instruction, with an increased emphasis on using the test item specifications to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Due to the illness and treatment the students experience that necessitate many absences, lessons are required to be compressed. By determining the most important standards and the ones that are the most heavily tested, we will use our instructional time more efficiently. All students who receive HH services are considered SWD, and therefore, attention to the instruction and progress of all students must be provided.
Action Step	
Description	1. Require collaborative groups to plan together at least once a week. 2. Utilize the Canvas platform to focus instruction and to provide review and reinforcement, beyond the instructional time period. 3. Provide coaching and feedback to teachers on lesson planning and instruction. 4. Monitor student progress and goal setting each quarter (to account for students who are new and existing). 5. Monitor student attendance and intervene, with families, as appropriate.
Person Responsible	Alicia Josephs Richardson (alicia.josephsrichardson@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Performance on the FSAA
Rationale	Many of the students who are enrolled in Hospital/Homebound have significant cognitive and/or physical disabilities. Many are medically fragile, with severe needs.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 25% of the students who receive instruction via Access Points will increase their achievement score from Level 1 to Level 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Theis (elizabeth.theis@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide professional development to teachers in order to improve understanding of the standards and the administration process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Although all of the teachers have met certification requirements and have extensive experience with students with significant needs, additional professional development will enable them to prepare lessons and resources that will benefit the students. Additionally, the results of the FSAA indicated that there were many technical errors in administration that would support increases as well. The district staff provided feedback about the technical errors that, if corrected, will yield more positive results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess teachers' needs and understanding 2. Meet with district staff to develop a plan and schedule for professional development. 3. Provide guided lesson planning. 4. Provide coaching and feedback to teachers, with respect to lesson planning, instruction, and assessment. 5. Monitor student progress each quarter to determine impact.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Theis (elizabeth.theis@ocps.net)

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).

1. Monitor attendance and participation with weekly reviews.

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.

NA--not Title I

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.

NA--not Title I

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

NA--not Title I

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.

NA--not Title I

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

NA--not Title I

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Performance on FSA**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Performance on the FSAA**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**