Manatee County Public Schools

Freedom Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 15

Budget to Support Goals 17

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom

Demographics

Principal: Guy Grimes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	44%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Manatee 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 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 15

Budget to Support Goals 17

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom

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 PK-5	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

We, the family of Freedom Elementary, in order to form a more dynamic school, establish a community of innovative learners, empower all students to reach their individual potential, provide a safe and secure environment, promote cultural diversity in an ever-changing world, and inspire a spirit of life-long learning for our school community, establish this mission for Freedom Elementary School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Freedom Elementary is to enhance our instructional delivery, with the purpose of increasing our students' academic achievement.

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
Grimes, Guy	Principal	
Danowski, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Dowd, Jenna	Other	
Winget, Carolyn	Other	
Cleveland, Kenzie	School Counselor	
Brunner, Sherri	School Counselor	

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	76	107	93	117	108	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	10	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	7	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

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	26	21	18	33	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	5	2	6	6	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	13	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	2	1	2	7	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	26	21	18	33	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	5	2	6	6	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	13	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	2	1	2	7	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	61%	52%	57%	57%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	64%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	57%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	68%	62%	50%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	53%	51%	31%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	48%	53%	49%	42%	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	76 (0)	107 (0)	93 (0)	117 (0)	108 (0)	135 (0)	636 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (26)	10 (21)	10 (18)	8 (33)	9 (22)	7 (27)	51 (147)
One or more suspensions	1 (5)	0 (2)	0 (6)	0 (6)	0 (20)	1 (20)	2 (59)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (13)	0 (19)	0 (18)	0 (50)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (14)	23 (30)	29 (31)	64 (75)

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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	65%	1%	64%	2%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	67%	60%	7%	60%	7%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	48%	13%	53%	8%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	18	38	37	21	51	47	20				
ELL	27	43	32	23	58	52	23				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	43	46	38	36	46	30	40				
HSP	41	56	44	39	61	45	46				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	76	74	69	75	72		81				
FRL	42	58	44	43	60	43	44				

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	10	32	37	14	37	29	18				
ELL	35	53	45	33	43	29	9				
ASN	85			92							
BLK	35	39	33	35	50	33					
HSP	39	47	44	42	51	35	41				
MUL	67			60							

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	71	58	47	78	69	54	70				
FRL	40	43	42	44	53	35	40				

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	7	45	50	19	21	26	13				
ELL	27	43	47	31	37	15	6				
BLK	32	48	33	34	42	42	31				
HSP	35	49	47	35	40	23	21				
MUL	87	79		79	71						
WHT	70	72	50	71	55	38	64				
FRL	39	53	43	39	38	31	34				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	100
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	75
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	50
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.

Freedom's data component that indicated the lowest performance was in the area of Math Lowest 25% percentile.
The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the change in curriculum resources, new staff and influx of students throughout the year.
Trends to note, that even though 3rd grade declined by 10% both 4th and 5th grade increased 4% and 3% respectively. This has been a pattern over the last three years with the exception of 3rd grade's decline.

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

The data component that that showed the greatest decline was overall Math Achievement by -3%.
The contributing factor was the decline in 3rd grade's overall Math performance by -10%.

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 data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was the Math Lowest 25th percentile by -7%.
The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the change in curriculum resources, new staff and influx of students throughout the year.
Trends to note, that even though 3rd grade declined by 10% both 4th and 5th grade increased 4% and 3% respectively. This has been a pattern over the last three years with the exception of 3rd grade's decline.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was ELA learning gains by 12%. The addition of a reading coach, Professional Development that was implemented, and the intense focus of using data to influence instruction help to improve this component.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, the potential area of concern is attendance.

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

1. The proficiency for Math Achievement will increase from 59% to 65% on the FSA by the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year. We have determined that we need 240 students in grades 3-5 out of 369 to to score proficient in order to achieve out goal of 65%.
2. The proficiency for ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 48% to 54% on the FSA by the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year, while 3rd grade overall ELA Achievement will increase from 55% to 65%. We have determined that we need 84 students in grade 3 out of 129 to score proficient in

order to achieve our goal of 65%.
3. In addition to the above areas of focus, our school will continue to develop the areas of increasing student attendance, and school safety. In the area of student attendance, we will be monitoring attendance and identifying anyone who falls below the 90% percentile. Those students identified will receive a letter and or phone call to inquire if any assistance is needed and a home visit by the school Social Worker will be conducted if there is no improvement. We will be adding additional fencing to the schools perimeter with the purpose of creating a safer environment.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile 2. Overall Math Achievement
Rationale	The two areas of focus in math were identified because of the drop in proficiency which includes the need to support our SWD, ELL and African American students. This focus addresses the students overall understanding of the mathematical standards in their current grade level.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The proficiency for Math Achievement will increase from 59% to 65% on the FSA by the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year. We have determined that we need 240 students in grades 3-5 out of 369 to score proficient in order to achieve out goal of 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Freedom will be implementing Acaletics for grades 3 and 4 in order to increase student proficiency. Fourth and fifth grades will be implementing Math in Practice in order to increase student proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy was proven success with various schools in our district. The school data we researched showed a double digit increase in student proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Purchase material 2. Provide Professional Development for the teachers 3. Implement the product 4. Monitor Student Progress 5. Adjust when needed
Person Responsible	Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

#2	
Title	1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 2. ELA 3rd grade overall achievement
Rationale	The two areas of focus in ELA were identified because of the drop in proficiency which includes supports our SWD, ELL and African American students. This focus addresses the students overall understanding of the ELA standards in their current grade level.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The proficiency for ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 48% to 54% on the FSA by the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year, while 3rd grade overall ELA Achievement will increase from 55% to 65%. We have determined that we need 84 students in grade 3 out of 129 to score proficient in order to achieve our goal of 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Freedom will be implementing standards based planning for 3rd grade, professional development around conferring with students, and restructuring for tier 2 and tier 3 services in order to increase student proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy was drawn from a survey on teacher's needs to support instructional delivery.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide monthly Professional Development from the book Reading Conferences by Jenifer Serravallo 2. Provide weekly support from our Curriculum Specialist in the area of standards based planning 3. Monitor through evaluations, data chats and lesson plans 4. Aligned instructional resources to support tier 2&3 services in the classroom 5.
Person Responsible	Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.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).

In addition to the above areas of focus, our school will continue to develop the areas of increasing student attendance, and school safety. In the area of student attendance, we will be monitoring attendance and identifying anyone who falls below the 90% percentile. Those students identified will receive a letter and or phone call to inquire if any assistance is needed and a home visit by the school Social Worker will be conducted if there is no improvement. We will be adding additional fencing to the school's perimeter with the purpose of creating a safer environment.

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

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.

All students who are entering Freedom are welcomed by an invitation shared with all local daycares who potentially could feed to Freedom. For incoming kindergarteners, we hold a Kindergarten Round Up where our nurse, classroom teachers, administration and support personnel are actively engaged in the enrollment process. Tours are given upon request by our guidance counselors for our new kindergarten students and their families. Students and families transitioning to Freedom from our VPK integrated classrooms meet teachers at the ESE transition meetings and proper academic goals are written to meet the needs of the student. Our VPK students traditionally show their readiness for kindergarten as evidenced through annual data.

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

Allocating our resources including personnel, instructional and curricular is established and planned amongst the Principal, Assistant Principal and Senior Secretary. Allocating proper student teacher ratios based on class size amendment is common practice. The careful consideration for our Self-Contained ESE classrooms, Inclusion and Resource Support are areas where we seek guidance and support from our ESE Teachers. We believe together we will create the best solution and environment for all students. The curriculum is balanced and shared amongst teachers to meet the needs of each student. Grade level curriculum and standards are necessary to teach but often times students need enrichment at a grade level above while others may need remediation.
Staff Allocations are reviewed daily with the support of Administration, Registrar and Senior Secretary. Instructional Resources are commonly discussed weekly and team leaders are responsible to communicate needs to either Administrator.

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.

HIGH SCHOOL

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: 1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile 2. Overall Math Achievement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 2. ELA 3rd grade overall achievement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00