

Pasco County Schools

East Pasco Education Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

East Pasco Education Academy

35830 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://epea.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Shelley Carrino

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Pasco 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

East Pasco Education Academy

35830 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://epea.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

JIEC will prepare students to be positive, contributing members of the community by committing to social, academic and emotional excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students achieve success in college, career and life.

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
Lammie, David	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Cloty	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/30/2020, Shelley Carrino

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.*

0

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

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	62	1	17	12	4	115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	28	0	7	3	1	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	35	1	13	7	1	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	42	0	10	5	1	68

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	1	15	11	4	31

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	11	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/30/2020

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	8	26	26	11	6	4	81
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	19	7	5	2	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	21	11	6	4	74
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	18	9	5	3	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	13	6	3	2	38

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	8	26	23	11	5	4	77

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	9	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8

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	8	26	26	11	6	4	81
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	19	7	5	2	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	21	11	6	4	74
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	18	9	5	3	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	13	6	3	2	38

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	8	26	23	11	5	4	77

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	9	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8

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%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	51%	0%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	56%	51%	0%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	70%	68%	0%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	73%	73%	0%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	15%	58%	-43%	56%	-41%
	2018	6%	58%	-52%	58%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
09	2019	15%	57%	-42%	55%	-40%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	17%	68%	-51%	46%	-29%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	20%	54%	-34%	48%	-28%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	70%	-60%	71%	-61%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	71%	-71%
Compare		10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
2018	36%	70%	-34%	68%	-32%
Compare		-36%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
HSP											
WHT											
FRL	10										
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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	3
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	14
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	59%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	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	0
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	5
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Attendance data has shown a significant increase in off-track students from 1st to 3rd quarter (48.91% to 81.52%). STAR data consistently shows over 90% of students below grade level in both reading and math.

Data trends in attendance may be attributed to the influx of new students from DAP meetings and the exiting of students that fulfill their placement requirements at the end of Fall semester.

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

Data declines in areas of testing are not available at this time due to the suspension of state testing during the Spring 2020 semester.

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.

With the suspension of state testing for the 2019-20 school year, this analysis is not possible at this time.

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

When looking at EWS data, the percentage of off-track students is lowest in the area of discipline, which was a major school focus this year (13-19% below quarterly course indicators.) The school has seen a decrease in the amount of bus referrals across the quarters which indicate positive results from collaboration between the school, bus garage, and drivers.

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

Based on EWS data, attendance and reducing behavioral incidences are potential areas of concern for the new year.

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

1. SIT and PLC structures will be utilized to develop support structures for all students, including the three targeted subgroups.
2. Utilize STAR and NWEA data with reading and math instructors to strategize on increasing all student scores, including the three targeted subgroups..
3. Activities designed to increase staff interaction and recognize staff accomplishments will be implemented.
4. The school will implement in-house training and partner with feeder patterns schools and HR, as need arises, to attract and retain qualified personnel.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: STAR and NWEA results will be utilized in in data chats with administration following each quarter’s testing cycle. Early release day training focusing on student engagement will also be utilized to provide teachers strategies to implement in order to increase student performance.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of students will see learning gains as measured by the assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data review and analysis of diagnostic testing should allow for students to know areas of academic strength and growth areas of students in order to better tailor instructional practice to address gap areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy engages in data driven decision making that should positively affect high-impact instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Staff will be trained on testing procedures and data analysis.

Person Responsible David Lammie (dlammie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

SIT and PLC structures will be utilized to develop support structures for students.

Person Responsible Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Early release day training focusing on student engagement will also be utilized to provide teachers strategies to implement in order to increase student performance.

Person Responsible Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Activities deigned to increase staff interaction and recognize staff accomplishments will be implemented.

Measurable Outcome: Sunshine committee will be restructured to help support increasing staff interactions and recognition of staff. Administration will also implement a monthly staff recognition program. Climate survey implemented will show a 25% increase in regard to feeling valued.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting teachers needs and having them feel valued are critical components to teacher retention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Selection of this area are based on the Staff Gallup Survey.

Action Steps to Implement

Sunshine committee will be restructured to help support increasing staff interactions and recognition of staff.

Person Responsible Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Administration will also implement a monthly staff recognition program.

Person Responsible Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

iii. Students and staff will participate in semester surveys in regard to school climate.

Person Responsible David Lammie (dlammie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Adult Education ABE/GED and ESOL teachers will utilize TABE, CASAS, and IXL data to develop individualized plans for students in order to increase student performance and fulfillment of program requirements.

Measurable Outcome: 70% of students in GED prep programs will attain have passing GED Ready scores or attain their GED, and 70% of ESOL students will either report attainment of their goals or report an increase in their language skills on an exit survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Lammie (dlammie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making when making instructional decisions for a diverse group of students is critical for student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Adult education students come to us with a variety of different academic levels making data to influence academic plans critical.

Action Steps to Implement

The testing center will report TABE and CASAS scores teachers for planning purposes. IXL's diagnostics and monitoring tools will be utilized by teachers do develop and monitor learning gains.

Person Responsible David Lammie (dlammie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

PLC structures will be utilized to develop support structures for all students, including the three targeted subgroups..

Person Responsible David Lammie (dlammie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Implement monthly career planning session with students implemented through career groups and middle school career components. Student services team members will develop and implement career groups.

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.

JIEC will implement various means of communication including, but not limited to, the school website, phone communication and digital learning platforms to keep stakeholders informed and engaged. The adult education program partners with PHCC to provide scholarships to the top academic performers in the GED program.

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00