

Orange County Public Schools

Castleview Elementary



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	13
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://castleviewes.ocps.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan Rasmussen

Start Date for this Principal: 1/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	

* 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 Orange 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	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://castleviewes.ocps.net>

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 KG-5	No	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Helton, Julie	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Clark, Mary	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; overseeing the exceptional student education program; and other duties as assigned by the principal.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/23/2019, Jonathan Rasmussen

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	
* 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	10	115	133	100	139	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	2	28	27	12	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0%	57%	57%	0%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	58%	0%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	63%	63%	0%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	62%	0%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	51%	0%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	53%	0%	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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
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
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
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

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

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 showing the lowest performance was English Language Arts for the Students with Disabilities subgroup. Seventy-eight percent (11 out of 14) of SWD scholars in our current fifth grade scored Level 1 or 2. Castleview does not have scores for last year's fourth or fifth grade scholars, as it is a new school and those scholars have matriculated to sixth grade. Additionally, state testing did not take place during the 2019-20 school year, therefore our current fourth graders do not have scores for these students. Factors contributing to last year's low performance may have been a lack of focus on SWD scholars; a lack of resources for accommodating SWD scholars; or inadequate classroom support for SWD scholars.

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

Because Castlevew is a new school and state testing did not take place during the 2019-20 school year, there is no prior data to compare.

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 Castlevew LY subgroup scored 31% in Levels 3 and above, opposed to 39% at the state level. This difference of 8% could be attributed to the percentage of newcomers within the subgroup; lack of ESOL strategies used during instruction; or a lack of differentiation of instruction among the varying ELL proficiency levels.

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

Because Castlevew is a new school and no state testing took place during the 2019-20 school year, there is no prior data to compare.

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

The EWS data indicates that 85 students are missing school at a higher rate than other students. This is one area that we will focus on during the 2020-21 school year. Additionally, 21 students have a course failure in ELA. We will need to focus on instructional strategies for closing achievement gaps in ELA during the 2020-21 school year.

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

1. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between SWD and general education scholars.
2. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between ELL and non-ELL scholars.
3. Closing the achievement gap in Math between SWD and general education scholars.
4. Closing the achievement gap in Math between ELL and non-ELL scholars.
5. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between Hispanic and white scholars.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on a review of both ELA and Mathematics FSA data from 2018-2019, achievement gaps exist among several subgroups at Castleview Elementary.

Measurable Outcome: Achievement gaps will be narrowed by at least 5% for the following subgroups in both ELA and Mathematics: LY, Hispanic, and SWD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Close reading will be utilized across all content areas to improve students' literacy skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "A significant body of research links the close reading of complex text—whether the student is a struggling reader or advanced—to significant gains in reading proficiency and finds close reading to be a key component of college and career readiness" (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, 2011, p. 7). Close reading strategies can be used to assist ALL learners in ALL subject areas, including mathematics. Orange County Public Schools has developed a professional development series based on close reading and other literacy strategies, which a team of educators from Castleview will attend. This support will drive the improvement in teaching and learning as the team returns to school and shares their learning with their colleagues.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The site based PLC team from Castleview will attend professional development in literacy strategies including close reading, text dependent questions, and evidence-based writing.
2. Teachers will be supported in their planning and implementation of these strategies through PLCs and coaching.
3. Student work will be examined in PLCs, and discussions regarding how to improve teaching and learning will occur.
4. Teachers will take part in peer observations to improve selected aspects of their practice.
5. Administrators will complete coaching, informal and formal observations, and give teachers feedback regarding the implementation of instructional strategies in their classroom.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Other specifically relating to Accelerating Student Achievement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 FSA data of the incoming fourth and fifth graders, 68% scored levels 3-5 on ELA and 79% scored levels 3-5 on Math. Strategies must be implemented that will lead to increased percentages of students who score on or above grade level.

Measurable Outcome: Castleview Elementary will achieve 75% of students scoring levels 3-5 on FSA ELA and 80% of students scoring levels 3-5 on FSA Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Writing in various forms, throughout all content areas, will be utilized to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Writing to Learn develops students' ideas and critical thinking. Writing to Learn supports student processing and interpretation.

Writing to Demonstrate Learning provides opportunities for students to communicate what they learned while developing writing skills through interacting with content.

Multiple resources were used to determine this focus, such as professional articles and districtwide training.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Site based Professional Learning Community members will attend training on evidence-based writing instruction.
2. Castleview teachers will participate in professional development regarding writing to learn and writing to demonstrate learning throughout the school year.
3. Castleview teachers and staff will collaborate in professional learning communities to share best practices and examine student writing to determine the next steps for instruction.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
 Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
 1. Improving attendance
 2. Closing the academic achievement gap
 3. Increasing academic proficiency for all students

Measurable Outcome: The EWS data indicates that 85 students are missing school at a higher rate than other students. This is one area that we will focus on during the 2020-21 school year. Additionally, 21 students have a course failure in ELA. We will need to focus on instructional strategies for closing achievement gaps in ELA during the 2020-21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Attend Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) training with a school-based team in order to learn strategies that will support social and emotional learning at the school site.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Work with the site based Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) team to present new strategies that are learned at the district SELL training to the teachers and staff.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Monitor the implementation of social and emotional learning strategies in classrooms and throughout the school via daily classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- 1. The site based PLC team from Castleview will attend professional development in literacy strategies including close reading, text dependent questions, and evidence-based writing.**
- 2. Teachers will be supported in their planning and implementation of these strategies through PLCs and coaching.**
- 3. Student work will be examined in PLCs, and discussions regarding how to improve teaching and learning will occur.**
- 4. Teachers will take part in peer observations to improve selected aspects of their practice.**
- 5. Administrators will complete coaching, informal and formal observations, and give teachers feedback regarding the implementation of instructional strategies in their classroom.**

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.

All Castleview students and staff are sorted into one of four houses. Our house system encourages students to be proud of their school and work hard to earn points for their house. High expectations are placed on all students allowing them to reach their maximum potential. Each week the house leader is announced, and each quarter the overall house winner receives the "Kingdom Cup" along with bragging rights. Families and the community participate in the joy that our house system provides our school community. Our staff members and students wear their house gear on Wednesdays and eat lunch with mixed grade levels in order to foster relationships across the school community.

Castleview Elementary encourages staff to engage in professional learning and fosters an environment of shared leadership. Our staff frequently engages in professional learning and brings that learning back to the school. They actively participate in committees of interest along with supporting clubs and before and after school extra curricular activities.

Our stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in our monthly School Advisory Council (SAC)

meetings where community input supports decision making at our school. During these meetings school wide data is discussed along with budgetary decisions and student and school needs. Additionally, our Parent and Teacher Organization (PTO) meets monthly to plan school and community events. Parent input is provided and the PTO votes on school-wide activities. Castlevew welcomes and encourages visitors to volunteer or become a Partner in Education. We welcome stakeholders to be active members in our school community.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Accelerating Student Achievement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00