Miami Community Charter School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mildrelis Rieumont

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2017

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: F (27%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: C (42%)
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	N/A

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

At MCCS (Miami Community Charter School), our faculty is committed to empowering our students through mentorship to be held accountable by teaching them to embrace responsibility, demonstrate mutual respect, and engage in open communication. Our continuous collaboration of all stakeholders will provide a safe and nurturing environment which promotes students' social-emotional and academic growth. Students will feel secure in embracing new challenges by identifying their individual strengths, motivating them through goals, and celebrating their victories. Through our endeavors and dedication to community service, our students will achieve their full potential and become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As life long learners, MCCS students will take ownership to transform obstacles into opportunities for a better community.

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
Alba-Quesada, Maria	Principal	
Fiallo, Raina	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Romy	Teacher, ESE	
Rodriguez, Lianet	Teacher, K-12	
Delgado, Ashley	Instructional Coach	
Lopez, Karinne	Teacher, K-12	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	Executive Director
Olmo, Jenifer	Dean	

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	81	87	93	93	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	6	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	7	15	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	10	28	11	55	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	1	4	14	12	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	4	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	1	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/6/2019

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	1	4	7	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	4	15	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	6	31	1	60	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	1	12	15	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	1	4	7	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	4	15	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	6	31	1	60	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	1	12	15	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	52%	62%	57%	33%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	62%	58%	30%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	58%	53%	25%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	69%	63%	35%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	66%	62%	25%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	55%	51%	21%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	55%	53%	17%	52%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Number of students enrolled	81 (0)	87 (0)	93 (0)	93 (0)	89 (0)	91 (0)	534 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (1)	6 (4)	6 (7)	3 (2)	3 (6)	9 (3)	28 (23)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (0)	5 (1)	7 (4)	15 (15)	17 (20)	25 (12)	70 (52)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 (1)	10 (6)	28 (31)	11 (1)	55 (60)	47 (48)	152 (147)

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	40%	60%	-20%	58%	-18%	
	2018	32%	61%	-29%	57%	-25%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%	
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	56%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		28%					
05	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%	
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	55%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%	
	2018	43%	67%	-24%	62%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%	
	2018	55%	68%	-13%	62%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		21%					
05	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%	
	2018	30%	66%	-36%	61%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%	
	2018	30%	56%	-26%	55%	-25%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
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	13	64		33	27						

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
ELL	47	71	63	47	48	37	30				
BLK	62	64		77	91						
HSP	51	73	70	52	52	42	37				
FRL	51	73	68	53	55	46	40				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD				8							
ELL	32	55	55	40	45	40	12				
BLK	32	69		32	54						
HSP	42	64	52	44	49	44	31				
FRL	41	64	53	43	50	42	31				

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
ELL	26	26	24	30	29	22	11				
BLK	37	15		37	8						
HSP	33	31	27	35	26	21	19				
FRL	34	30	23	35	26	22	18				

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	56
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	51
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	74
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	55
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
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 with the lowest performance, was Science (5th grade). The contributing factor to the last year's low performance, can be contributed to the lack of academic language, and vocabulary which is contributed to the fact that 35% of 5th grader students were ELL students, and 42% were former ELL students.

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

The Lowest 25% in Mathematics had the greatest decline from the prior year. he contributing factor to the last year's low performance, can be contributed to the lack of academic language, and vocabulary which is contributed to the fact that 46% of the students at Miami Community Charter School are ELL learners, while 14% are former ELL learners.

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 Science Achievement. The factor that contributed to this gap was the high ELL population at our school. ELL learners struggle with acquiring language and retaining the Tier 3 vocabulary pertaining to science content.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25%. The new actions that were taken that contributed to this improvement were: daily intervention, extended school day tutoring sessions, teacher training and professional development.

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

The area of concern based on the EWS data from Part I (D), is "Level 1 on statewide assessment" 152 students have scored a Level 1 (or equivalent) on the statewide assessments.

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

1. Lowest 25% Mathematics
2. Science

3. Grade 3 ELA Proficiency
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Differentiate instruction with a focus on rigor in all content areas to increase student growth.
Rationale	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement in all data components will increase by 5 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Maria Alba-Quesada (malbaquesada@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments

Action Step

Description	1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to : -Rigor -Unpacking the Standards-ELA -Universal Design and Backwards Planning 2. Differentiated Instruction, based on formative and summative assessments including biweekly i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments (Reading and Math), Houghton Mifflin-Journey's Standards Based Assessments (Biweekly-Reading); Topic Assessments (Math and Science). 3. i-Ready ELA and Math online platform is used as ongoing progress monitoring tool, for Assessment Period 1, 2, and 3. Growth monitoring checks take place every 20 instructional days to monitor remedial instruction. 4. Extended school day to be used ELA and Math tutorials.120 additional minutes weekly. Triumph Learning Performance and Support Coach are being implemented (ELA and Math). 5. Weekly walk throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction. 6. Intervention is provided daily for students in Tier 3, and 3 times weekly for students in Tier 2, the i-Ready instructional grouping profile indicates which skills students need remediation in and provides the instructional resources to provide the intervention.

7. During the school day tutoring, is scheduled for students categorized in the Lowest 25% of Reading, and Mathematics.

8. iXL Science is implemented as an ongoing progress monitoring tool for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Science.

9. A paraprofessional is assigned to 5th grade Science classes, to provide additional support and remediation based on the results of the Science topic assessments, and the data from iXL.

10. A Reading coach is assigned to small groups during Reading classes, and assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th, to disaggregate biweekly data, and monitor and guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.

10. A Mathematics coach is assigned to small groups during Math classes, and assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th to disaggregate biweekly data, and monitor and guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.

11. A science instructional leader is assigned to work with our STEAM program.

12. ELL coordinator/Liaison is assigned to work with teachers to implement WIDA Can do Descriptors, and methodology as well supporting the delivery of instruction, and implementing ESOL strategies in instruction.

Person Responsible Maria Alba-Quesada (malbaquesada@dadeschools.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).

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.

The School's PFEP is attached.

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.

To ensure that the students social-emotional needs of students are being met, the school employs a behavior specialist and a guidance counselor to address the counseling, mentoring, and any other guidance services that the student's may need.

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

Kindergarten parents attend two orientations six months prior to the beginning of the school. At this time, the parents receive two summer assignments to prepare students in the areas of Language Arts and Math. The parents take a tour of the entire school, accompanied by, the K-5 lead teachers, Ms. Stone, Ms. Duyos, Ms. Lopez and Mrs. Rodriguez, who introduce the parents to the Kindergarten team, the curriculum to be taught, and the classroom setting. Parent workshops will be offered, for the parents, to provide parents with resources available to them, as well as school resources that they can utilize to monitor and follow up with their child's progress. Upon entrance to the school, Kindergartners are assessed using i-Ready and monitored throughout the school year, using i-Ready as well as bi weekly assessments.

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.

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet with the principal and the Board of Directors/Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) support MTSS. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures. The MTSS team will provide the school with the proper framework for effective MTSS. The framework will be aligned with the policies and procedures of the district, the school and the classroom. The MTSS will meet monthly to discuss data derived from the ongoing interventions and to discuss the problem solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services. The administration will monitor instruction and curriculum to ensure students are receiving the correct level of support whether universal, supplemental, or intensive, as well as the implementation of RtI to ensure compliance with intervention and documentation, provide adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Guidance will be provided on the K-12 reading plan, facilitate and support data collection activities, assist in data analysis and provide technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, and support the implementation of Tier 1,Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans. Classroom teachers and SPED teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 activities. The counselor, school psychologist, and other student services personnel will meet with the team to address specific problems or concerns

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's PFEP is attached.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Differentiate instruction with a focus on rigor in all content areas to increase student growth.	$0.00
		Total:	$100,811.50