Don Brewer Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Don Brewer Elementary School

3385 HARTSFIELD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/donbrewer

Demographics

Principal: Amy Novak

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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

Don Brewer Elementary School

3385 HARTSFIELD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/donbrewer

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 3-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

To provide a safe learning environment where students are challenged daily to meet high academic expectations through standards-based instruction and to nurture in each student a life-long love of learning and a commitment to responsible citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Don Brewer Elementary School's vision is to be a collaborative learning community dedicated to engaging and empowering students to become responsible and productive life-long learners.

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
Novak, Amy	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Campus Safety/Security, Staff Professional Development and Support, Facilities Management, Parent Outreach, Community Partnerships, Curriculum Planning and Development, Staff Evaluation and Assessment, Data Disaggregation, Visionary Planning, Social Media Marketing
Poliseo, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student Mental Health, Guidance Lessons and Support, ESE Support, ELL/ESOL Support, Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Mitchell, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Math Curriculum/Instruction Support
Royce, Erin	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Staff Development and Evaluation, Student Discipline
Komatina, Michael	Instructional Coach	New Teacher Professional Development Support, ELA Curriculum/Instruction Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Amy Novak

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.*
2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	152	147	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	53	37	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	71	50	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	98	48	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	82	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/5/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	159	161	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	31	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	101	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

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	2	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	0	159	161	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	31	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	101	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

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	2	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	46%	50%	57%	49%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	58%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	54%	62%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	63%	62%	71%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	63%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	48%	53%	58%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	3	4	5	
	(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	41%	51%	-10%	58%	-17%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	64%	-11%	64%	-11%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	61%	-7%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%	
	2018	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
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	17	45	42	21	50	50	29				
ELL	12	45	47	20	81	77	20				
ASN	64			82							
BLK	38	51	53	45	46	41	45				
HSP	42	50	36	44	52		50				
MUL	74	70		76	70		67				
WHT	57	58	65	67	59	50	70				
FRL	37	50	49	47	51	47	39				

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	16	20	17	25	40	24	30				
ELL	25	44		28	41						
ASN	60	58		67	62						
BLK	39	37	36	52	47	35	57				
HSP	47	43	30	45	41	33	42				
MUL	68	64		69	59		64				
WHT	64	55	38	73	64	43	84				
FRL	43	41	33	54	49	34	57				

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	18	56	60	27	52	56	40				
ELL	33			60							
ASN	53	64		87	64						
BLK	42	58	58	52	68	63	44				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
HSP	47	65		58	69	60	69				
MUL	53	43		82	71		80				
WHT	63	66	71	73	77	54	70				
FRL	43	57	54	56	68	60	52				

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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
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	61
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	48
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.

ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains - 3rd - 5th grade students struggle with foundational skills; Working in partnership with the primary feeder school is critical to addressing the gap in skills prior to testing grades

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

Science Proficiency - stand-alone 5th grade unit continue to be an area of concern. Individual student data at benchmarks and PMA did not indicated the possible loss of overall proficiency. Additional formative assessments must be analyzed to monitor this data point more consistently throughout the school year.

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.

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains - continued focus on purposeful interventions and support in mathematical skills, as well as specified standards must be implemented with fidelity throughout the school year to address student needs

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

ELA Learning Gains overall and LPQ - varied intervention programs provided students with specific skills and support each day during the ELA instructional block

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

1. Performance of students with disabilities
2. Math Learning Gains

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

1. Providing differentiated instruction for students with disabilities
2. Implement the ELA instructional framework and intervention programs with fidelity
3. Implement the Math intervention programs with fidelity and instructional framework with fidelity
4. Increase parent involvement and communication
5. Improve the implementation of the standard based protocol

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Complete Learning Arc (steps 1 - 4) ; fidelity of implementation of standards-based protocol through professional development conducted by the Reading and Math Coaches
Measurable Outcome:	90% of core content teachers will use standards-based protocols during PLCs and Common Planning, rating good/strong on standards-based continuum rubric
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide weekly professional development to assist teachers with standards based protocols 2. Teachers will utilize a poster maker to create standards based anchor charts and visual aids for students 3. Teachers will use projector and document camera to provide standard based visuals for students 4. Paraprofessionals work with small groups to implement intervention programs 5. Students in Gr3-5 will utilize blended learning programs that provide both differentiated and grade level standard activities. Programs will include iReady and Freckle. 6. Students will participate in STEM activities relating to standards through the PITSCO lab class
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Reading & Math Coach - Teachers will understand, plan, and teach grade level standards 2. Poster Maker - Classroom equipment will be added to enhance learning, and student engagement and increase academic skills in the classroom. A poster maker will be used to create anchor charts and additional items to use by classroom teachers with students. 3. Projector & Document Camera - Classroom equipment will be added to enhance learning and increase academic skills in the classroom. Document cameras will be used to allow teachers to share resources, as well as provide clearer instructional deliver, along with additional innovative items with students in the classroom. 4. Paras - will understand, plan, and teach intervention programs 5. Freckle - Gr3 Tier 1 & Tier 2 Blended Learning, Gr4-5 Freckle subscriptions funded by the district 6. PITSCO - Materials used by students in the STEM lab to support reading, math and science standards (Previously known as the STEAM initiative in our district)

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide professional development relating to a standards-based protocol	
Person Responsible	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)
Collect school-wide baseline data, utilizing standards-based walkthrough tool	
Person Responsible	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)
Monitor utilization of standards-based protocol through PLCs and standards-based walkthroughs	
Person Responsible	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly assess using the standards-based school continuum

Person Responsible Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 5 Essentials data shows a neutral rating for Involved Families; the lowest rated category for 2019
Measurable Outcome:	Data on the 5Essesntials survey will show an increase in Involved Families/ Parent Involvment; scoring a strong on the 5Essentials rubric
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implementation of ClassDojo school wide to be used by teachers and school to communicate with families with a goal of 90% parent connection 2. Use of Parent Link to send weekly message to families 3. Expand use of social media (Twitter, Facebook and/or Instagram) to highlight unique programs and activities 4. Parent Liaison works to provide updated information to families and participates in the planning of PFEP events
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase parent involvement and positive interactions between the school and stakeholders

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development to faculty and staff on use of ClassDojo
2. Complete a Social Media Posting Calendar

Person Responsible Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Implement weekly/monthly PLC and common planning

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.

Calm Classroom initiative implemented school-wide
PBIS team will collaborate with peer to identify restorative justice practices
Parent Liaison will help to increase parent involvement, monitor parent accounts and provide contact support

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00