

Polk County Public Schools

Garden Grove 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

<http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove>

Demographics

Principal: Laura Neidringhaus

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

<http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove>

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	Yes	91%
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	C	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Believing all children can learn, we will work together in a safe and caring environment, guiding each individual toward lifelong learning and responsible productive citizens..

Provide the school's vision statement.

Garden Grove Elementary School will dedicate its leadership and resources to creating a positive learning environment based on research and high yield strategies. Decisions on instruction will be data-driven using formative and summative data. Teachers will be expected to follow curriculum maps. Tier II and Tier III will be provided for students that are below level, have not mastered grade level standards, and are at-risk. Remediation will be provided for all students that have not mastered a particular skill.

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
Bergwall, Shauna	Principal	The Principal will oversee all instructional decisions and intervention data as well as school operations.
Greene, Stephanie	Other	
Smith, Susan	Instructional Coach	
Bearden, Melissa	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	106	87	81	83	77	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	8	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	4	5	12	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
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)

26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	53%	51%	57%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	51%	58%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	53%	26%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	57%	63%	60%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	47%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	51%	36%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	35%	46%	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	106 (0)	87 (0)	81 (0)	83 (0)	77 (0)	90 (0)	524 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 (0)	15 (0)	8 (0)	11 (0)	12 (0)	3 (0)	64 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (18)	18 (0)	35 (0)	59 (18)

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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	51%	47%	4%	56%	-5%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	56%	-11%	64%	-19%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	65%	51%	14%	60%	5%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	45%	3%	53%	-5%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
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	31	33		31	43	36	27				
ELL	20	50		40	50	50					
BLK	30	44	41	36	38	41	6				
HSP	49	54		57	54	55	64				
MUL	64			91							
WHT	64	56	45	74	67	57	60				
FRL	44	51	45	51	54	50	42				

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	34	55	54	35	36	36	10				
ELL	7			43							
BLK	25	43	54	47	46	40	22				
HSP	62	73		66	79		74				
MUL	62			85							
WHT	64	52	54	75	55	45	63				
FRL	43	54	53	63	57	57	49				
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	31	25	25	42	38	29	7				
ELL	22	21		50	50						
BLK	28	30	26	34	29	33	9				
HSP	56	45		60	50		39				
WHT	59	46	9	71	51	31	45				
FRL	44	41	32	53	45	46	28				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	49

English Language Learners	
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	
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	34
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	59
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	78
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	60
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	48
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Lowest 25th percentile learning gains in ELA. This is a trend for the last two years. Lack of intervention implementation is a contributing factor.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the lowest 25th percentile learning gains in ELA. The contributing factor was a lessened emphasis on intervention implementation.

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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the lowest 25th percentile learning gains in ELA. This is a trend based on the past two years data. The contributing factor is a lack of emphasis on intervention implementation.

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

There was no data component that showed improvement. Only one area, math learning gains, showed no decline or improvement.

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

Proficiency on state assessments is an area of concern.

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

1. Tier 1 core instruction in ELA and math
2. Tier 2/3 intervention implementation
3. Monitoring of Tier 2/3 data
4. LSI strategy implementation
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Tier 1 instruction
Rationale	Our tier 1 instruction needs to be enhanced to increase proficiency in ELA and math

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve The school will increase proficiency by 5 points in ELA and math for 2020

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy LSI strategies will be implemented for tier 1 instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy LSI strategies encourage teaming and checks for understanding based on students' justification of their thinking. LSI professional development is delivered and monitored.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LSI PD in August and September 2. LSI Coaching 4 Improvement (C4I) days are planned to monitor implementation 3. Collaborative planning focuses on standard-target-success criteria-task alignment 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

#2

Title	Tier 2/3
Rationale	Interventions must be implemented and monitored for effectiveness

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve The learning gains of all and of the lowest 25th percentile will increase by 5 points in 2020

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Student Success Team (SST) meetings will take place to analyze intervention data and make instructional decisions

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Monitoring of intervention data will ensure all learners are improving

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administer ongoing progress monitoring assessments 2. Examine data 3. Form, implement and monitor tier 2/3 instruction 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.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).

These two areas of focus encompass our schoolwide improvement priorities

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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources):

- CHAMPS
- PBIS

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

The Leadership Team meets on a regular basis to adjust and adapt instructional resources to align instruction with the Florida Standards to meet the needs of all students.

The Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Interventionist, and teachers analyze student data to ensure meaningful instruction based on students' needs.

Title 1 funds were allotted to hire a Literacy Coach and Interventionist. The Guidance Counselor, Coach, Interventionist, and ESE staff will meet on a regular basis to monitor student progress and troubleshoot issues as they occur. Following the MTSS process the Leadership team meets to ensure all possible resources are being implemented with fidelity. Once we have identified the students' and teachers' needs to best address the strategies and levels of students we use our Title 1 money to purchase resources for the highest impact. Personnel are placed in the grade levels that will bring the best results. We are provided with a TRST for ESOL that provides training for ESOL strategies, and analyzing the Access data. ESE support personnel, provides help with scheduling, interventions, and placement. Programs that are available to our families through federal, state, and local funds are Hearth, United Way, and the Polk Education Foundation.

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.

- Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.
- Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
- Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
- Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district. Also, may reimburse certification exam fees for teachers placed in an area in which they do not yet have certification in upon successful passing of exam.
- Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.
- Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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

The school participates in the Great American Teach-In to expose students to various careers and paths to achieve. College spirit days are planned to increase awareness of college options.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Tier 1 instruction				\$155,726.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	312-Subagreements greater than \$25,000	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: Contract with LSI for 2 PD days, 4 C4I days and additional virtual support.</i>			
	2110	100-Salaries	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$48,550.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Interventionist</i>			
	2110	100-Salaries	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$52,150.00

			Notes: Literacy Coach			
	2110	100-Salaries	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$7,497.97
			Notes: Personnel for Extended Learning (Tutoring) and Robotics			
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$624.00
			Notes: Service agreement with Orlando Science Center for parent night			
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$2,600.00
			Notes: Agendas			
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$304.11
			Notes: Supplies for family events			
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$4,000.00
			Notes: Winter Haven PEP in-school tutoring			
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			\$10,000.00
			Notes: LSI conference			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Tier 2/3				\$0.00
Total:						\$155,726.08