Hellen Caro Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hellen Caro Elementary School

12551 MEADSON RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Amy Roby H   Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.](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

Hellen Caro Elementary School

12551 MEADSON RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

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)
Elementary School KG-5	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Hellen Caro Elementary is to create a learning environment that provides every student with the skills necessary to ensure success for their future education through a partnership among parents, school staff, teachers and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Hellen Caro Elementary School is to create an environment where students want to learn, faculty and staff want to work, and parents want to send their children to school.

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
Moore, Sandra	Principal	Sandra Moore - leads SAC, engages PTA, Data Team, Safety Committee, oversees grade level planning, plans for Professional Development based on needs, and serves as LEA Jennifer Whatley-assess students in Tier III, meets with parents and determines if a student is eligible for any services Andrea McGinnis-serves as the Speech Pathologist and also works with ESE and General Ed. teachers to ensure accommodations are in place for students in Speech and Language Denise Choron-meets with teachers and parents to write Tier II and Tier III, and monitors intervention data to determine if the student is making progress, Coordinates Youth Mentor Program Saundra Bell--meets with teachers and parents to write Tier II and Tier III, and monitors intervention data to determine if the student is making progress Julie Pearson-serves as LEA, plans with Data Team, monitors and ensures students receive accommodations for testing, attends SAC meetings, coordinates Volunteer Program, leads MTSS Team
Whatley, Jennifer	Psychologist	
McGinnis, Andrea	Other	
Choron, Denise	School Counselor	
Bell, Saundra	School Counselor	
Duvall, Julie	Assistant Principal	

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	125	140	130	115	113	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	12	11	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	5	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	10	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
57

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/20/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	4	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	6	4	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	70%	53%	57%	75%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	59%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	53%	53%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	57%	63%	70%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	60%	62%	59%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	42%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	54%	53%	58%	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	125 (0)	140 (0)	130 (0)	115 (0)	113 (0)	115 (0)	738 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (4)	11 (6)	12 (4)	11 (11)	9 (2)	6 (2)	56 (29)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	0 (1)	2 (0)	3 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (6)	5 (3)	4 (3)	1 (3)	0 (4)	13 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (5)	13 (12)	18 (18)	37 (35)

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	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%	
	2018	73%	52%	21%	57%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%	
	2018	78%	51%	27%	56%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-15%					
Cohort Comparison		-10%					
05	2019	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%	
	2018	58%	44%	14%	55%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		16%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%	
	2018	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	74%	58%	16%	64%	10%	
	2018	84%	58%	26%	62%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison		8%					
05	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%	
	2018	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison		-6%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	72%	55%	17%	53%	19%	
	2018	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
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	31	47	43	31	63	68	39				

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
BLK	43	40	33	48	63	47	47				
HSP	71	63		70	75		60				
MUL	78	60		76	83		86				
WHT	74	64	53	72	75	64	77				
FRL	56	56	49	57	71	58	57				

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	30	37	38	37	50	50	24				
BLK	37	55	40	51	60	50	47				
HSP	71	55		76	75		46				
MUL	78	69		76	97		61				
WHT	74	54	46	75	75	69	76				
FRL	53	51	46	58	69	70	47				

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	40	48	47	35	36	38	17				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	45	23		55	54						
HSP	68	63		70	63		40				
MUL	77	57		74	57		70				
WHT	77	63	56	71	59	43	60				
FRL	68	57	54	58	56	41	53				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	46
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	68
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	77
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	68
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	58
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.

Students with disabilities (SWD) performed the lowest in ELA Achievement (31%) and Math Achievement (31%). SWD increased 1% in ELA proficiency; however, SWD declined 6% in Math proficiency. Staff changes in fourth grade is a possible contributing factor.

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

Black students decreased 15% in ELA Learning Gains. Our data team focused on our black male population providing extra data chats and small group instruction. Our team will need to continue to broaden this focus to include black females, also.

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.

Every component is higher than the state average.

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

Multi-cultural students made a 25% increase in Science Proficiency. Fifth grade teachers utilized SchoolNet data to group students. The students completed standards based science rotations.

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

38 students earned a Level 1 on State Assessments.

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

1. Lowest Quartile in Math decreased 9%. The Black Subgroup decreased 35, the White Subgroup decreased 5%, and the Free and Reduced Lunch Subgroup decreased 12%.

2. Overall students decreased 4% in Math proficiency.

3. Attendance below 90 percent increased from 29 students to 56 students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our math Lowest Quartile learning gains decreased by 9%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the Lowest Quartile will show a 10% increase in learning gains when comparing the 2018-2019 FSA Math results with the 2019-2020 FSA Math results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will utilize STAR 360 to progress monitor students. We will utilize iReady Math to assign individualized lessons. iReady reports will be used to target standards not mastered. Reteach components of Pearson Math and spiral review will be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring and direct instruction are effective, researched-based strategies. STAR360 and iReady have been adopted by our district based on research and correlation to the Florida State Standards.

Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR 360 Math AP1 2. Administer iReady Math Diagnostic 3. Set target goals 4. Assign individualized lessons in iReady 5. Progress monitor results
Person Responsible	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

#2	
Title	Student Math Proficiency
Rationale	Student math proficiency decreased by 4%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency in math will increase 10% when comparing the 2018-2019 FSA Math results with the 2019-2020 FSA Math results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will utilize STAR 360 to progress monitor students. We will utilize iReady Math to assign individualized lessons. iReady reports will be used to target standards not mastered. Reteach components of Pearson Math and spiral review will be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring and direct instruction are effective, researched-based strategies. STAR360 and iReady have been adopted by our district based on research and correlation to the Florida State Standards.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR 360 Math AP1 2. Administer iReady Math Diagnostic 3. Set target goals 4. Assign individualized lessons in iReady 5. Progress monitor results
Person Responsible	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

#3	
Title	Federal Index-Black/African American Students
Rationale	Black students decreased 15% in ELA Learning Gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the black subgroup will increase 15% in ELA Learning Gains when compared to the 2018-2019 FSA results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Individual data chats (students will be assigned to other individuals on campus as well as their classroom teacher), iReady, STAR360 progress monitoring, direct instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring and direct instruction are effective, researched-based strategies. STAR360 and iReady have been adopted by our district based on research and correlation to the Florida State Standards.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR 360 ELA AP1 2. Administer iReady ELADiagnostic 3. Set target goals 4. Assign individualized lessons in iReady 5. Progress monitor results
Person Responsible	Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

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).

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

Parents and Guardians may choose from any one of the Escambia County's 80+ private pre-schools and faith based pre-schools. Children who live near a public school may be eligible to attend at that school.

Incoming kindergarten students are screened before school begins to determine the readiness of each child coming into our kindergarten program. Kindergarten students also participate in an additional orientation to help familiarize them with the school setting.

Hellen Caro works closely with our feeder middle school, Jim C. Bailey MS, to provide a smoother transition for our students into the middle school environment. 5th graders are introduced to extracurricular programs through flyers and assemblies presented by Jim C. Bailey's staff members.

Hellen Caro Elementary provides speech and language services to three and four years olds who are identified and staffed in the SLI program.

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

The MTSS team meets on a weekly basis to review student progress through the MTSS. Team members review screening data and link that data to instructional decisions. They also review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks and those who are at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources that are needed to meet the needs of students in MTSS. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, practice new processes and skills, and make decisions about current and future implementation.

Services for English Language Learners (ELL) are provided as required by law.

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free appropriate education.
Hellen Caro uses SAI monies to buy additional classroom teaching supplies and materials for all K-5 and ESE classrooms. SAI monies are also sometimes used to fund transportation for educational field trips when needed.

The school offers non-violence and anti-drug programs to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our school's School Wide Behavior Management Plan (MTSS), we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying.

Housing programs are offered at the district level and are overseen by the Title I District office. This program is not applicable to our school.

Head Start is offered through the school district although not applicable to Hellen Caro.

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

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Math Proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Federal Index-Black/African American Students	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**