

Escambia County School District

Jim Allen Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Jim Allen Elementary School

1051 N HIGHWAY 95A, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Cross L

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 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.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Jim Allen Elementary School

1051 N HIGHWAY 95A, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

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 Jim Allen Elementary is to ensure that every student has self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible, contributing, and satisfied life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the goal of Jim Allen School to prepare each child who enters here to function effectively and responsibly in a challenging society by providing learning experiences appropriate to individual needs, interests, aspirations, abilities, and creative potential. We believe that to achieve, to succeed and to accomplish are important goals but not at the expense of the human values that make a community a place that sustains all its members. We therefore strive not only to maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere in which each child can develop into his/her highest potential but also to instill a sense of discipline and responsibility toward self, family, school, community and country.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Watts, Rachel	Principal	
west, emily	Teacher, K-12	
dorman, susan	Assistant Principal	
Guilford, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
coleman, richard	Teacher, K-12	
Helton, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Sherbrook, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Solari, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Shannon Cross L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 .	

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	69	93	101	108	75	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	9	18	22	190	100	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	355
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	5	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	5	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/14/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	84	107	112	74	84	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	10	28	27	12	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	2	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	7	15	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	84	107	112	74	84	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	10	28	27	12	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	2	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	7	15	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	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	58%	53%	57%	57%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	49%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	30%	43%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	60%	57%	63%	53%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	60%	62%	63%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	52%	51%	48%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	54%	53%	60%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	56%	3%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	55%	0%	62%	-7%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	58%	0%	64%	-6%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	67%	55%	12%	60%	7%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	61%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	55%	4%	53%	6%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	19	47	52	20	44	40	13				
BLK	38	41	43	40	53	35	36				
MUL	64	64		71	64						
WHT	62	62	55	64	67	43	61				
FRL	52	51	48	53	60	40	47				
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	19	16	14	27	51	43	44				
BLK	47	45	18	44	50		67				
MUL	73			82							
WHT	59	41	30	66	69	64	61				
FRL	52	43	27	57	69	63	61				
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	12	15	16	14	36	28	16				
BLK	44	50	36	33	61		33				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	59	46	26	56	63	45	63				
FRL	51	45	25	46	61	47	54				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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.

Lowest component- Math lowest 25% decreased by 19 points. Our focus during 2018 was math instruction, therefore, the scores increased. In 2019 our focus was the lower quartile students for ELA. The shift in academic school-wide focus may have contributed to the decrease. When looking at the data our SWD subgroup is the lowest for math achievement.

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

Greatest decline- Math lowest 25% decreased by 19 points. Our focus during 2018 was math instruction, therefore, the scores increased. In 2019 our focus was the lower quartile students for ELA. The shift in academic school-wide focus may have contributed to the decrease. When looking at the data our SWD subgroup is the lowest for math achievement.

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.

Greatest gap when compared to the state average is the same component-Math lowest 25%. Jim Allen scored 12% below the state average in this component.

Our focus during 2018 was math instruction, therefore, the scores increased. In 2019 our focus was the lower quartile students for ELA. The shift in academic school-wide focus may have contributed to the decrease. When looking at the data our SWD subgroup is the lowest for math achievement.

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

Most improvement- ELA learning learning gains. Increase by 15%; same as the state average; 3% above the district average. Our focus was the ELA lower quartile students. We had a reading club and each student in the lower 30% received a faculty mentor. The mentor simply encouraged the student to read books and take AR tests.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Attendance below 90%= 120 students
2. Number of students retained in 1st grade. (11/15)

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

1. Math Lowest 25th percentile
2. Math subgroup SWD
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Lower 25% (continue what we implemented)
5. ELA Achievement (continue what we implemented)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus	Students in the lower quartile and students with disabilities had a decrease in math learning gains during the 2018-2019 school year.
Description and Rationale:	Identified as a critical need based on the 19% decrease from 2018-19.
Measurable Outcome:	Jim Allen Elementary School will increase the percentage of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in the component of Math by 10% on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment. 2019-39%; Goal for 2020-49%. Our student with disabilities will increase by 8 percent Federal Index from 34% Federal index to 42% Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based-strategy we will implement is from the Math for Elementary 2017 The University of Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk. We will focus on differentiated instruction at the tier 2 and tier 3 level during small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Remedial teacher provides differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Remedial teacher uses explicit instruction when introducing new math content. Examples include: 1. Teachers extend the math learning of students exceeding grade-level expectations and work on foundational skills with students not meeting grade level expectations. 2. Teachers model math problems step by step. Students participate in guided practice with the teacher and independent practice with teacher feedback. 3. Teachers design planned and organized lessons, ask the right questions, require frequent student response, and provide affirmative and corrective feedback. According to Math for Elementary by the Meadows Center this strategy showed a positive correlation to improving student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Our action steps will include:

1. Data analysis from the 2019-2020 progress monitoring data including STAR 360 and i-Ready to determine who is in need of initial tier 2 and 3 differentiated instruction in math.
2. Teachers will receive professional development teaching tier 1, 2, 3 in math provided by district math specialist with a focus on differentiate instruction in tier 2 and 3. The PD will also focus on how to do remote small group instruction for students that will not be attending the traditional setting.
3. We hired a remedial teacher for small group explicit instruction.
4. We will continue to review progress monitoring data to include STAR 360, i-Ready, and unit assessments and track the data of the students in the lower quartile and those in the students with disabilities ESSA group to determine if the interventions of differentiated instruction during small group is effective.

Person Responsible Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our school leadership team will meet monthly to discuss current data, with the focus on students in our lower math quartile. We will continue to implement the Jim Allen Reading Club for our lower quartile students in ELA. We will also discuss strategies on how to decrease the number of tardies and unexcused absences.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The mission of Jim Allen Elementary is to ensure that every student has self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible, contributing, and satisfied life. Our school vision also states, "We therefore strive not only to maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere in which each child can develop into his/her highest potential but also to instill a sense of discipline and responsibility toward self, family, school, community and country." In order to fulfill our mission and vision for our students we involve all stakeholders. Stakeholders include SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Business Partners, Volunteers, Mentors, Teachers, Staff and Families. We strive to work together to have a positive, encouraging, safe and secure environment for our students. Our stakeholders provide feedback on our school policies and procedures. We rely on the input of others to make changes and additions to our program for the success of all of our students. Volunteers and mentors spend countless hours working with our students both academically and emotionally. Our staff utilizes researched-based educational practices to teach our students of greatest need. Our partners provide supplies, food for the weekend backpack program and funds to purchase educational items that promote academic achievement in English Language Arts, Science and Mathematics. Together, we all make a difference in the lives of our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00