South Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://southelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Lonnie Steiert

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.](http://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

South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://southelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

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	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

It is the mission of South Elementary School to prepare children for college and career by addressing the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SES will create a fun and safe learning environment for all students while instilling an enthusiasm for reading and solid foundation of academic fluency skills in order to prepare students for colleges and careers.

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
Streelman, Emily	Principal	Ensure the use of curriculum, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, communicate expectations and details of the SIP, hire and evaluate staff.
Hawk, Heather	Instructional Coach	Assess reading achievement progress, provide professional development and coaching for teachers, plan and implement PLCs based on school-level instructional trend data.
	School Counselor	Track ELL student progress, counsel students, coordinate with instructional staff on student matters, coordinate school-wide state testing.
McCluskey, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Conference with parents to discuss student behavioral concerns, respond to disciplinary issues, oversee school facilities, manage safety team, provide professional development on instructional strategies, PBIS, and classroom management; evaluate instructional staff.
Tedders , Dana	Other	Promote a love of literacy, empower students to be critical thinkers through the use of AVID strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/1/2018, Lonnie Steiert

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	76	104	102	69	75	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	13	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	10	6	3	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	4	3	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	3	2	11	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	33	98	82	89	82	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	12	10	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	5	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	21	15	23	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	8	3	6	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	33	98	82	89	82	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	12	10	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	5	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	21	15	23	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	8	3	6	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	49%	52%	57%	58%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	66%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	55%	53%	68%	57%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	62%	63%	68%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	62%	63%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	42%	51%	69%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	53%	66%	42%	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	52%	59%	-7%	58%	-6%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	46%	-1%	58%	-13%
	2018	48%	41%	7%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					
05	2019	43%	50%	-7%	56%	-13%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	59%	66%	-7%	62%	-3%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2018	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	59%	60%	-1%	64%	-5%	
	2018	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		13%					
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	60%	-5%	
	2018	78%	56%	22%	61%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		-23%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	40%	44%	-4%	53%	-13%	
	2018	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-23%					
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	24	49	67	38	49	32	15				
ELL	33	43	53	51	45	20	10				
BLK	26	42		39	50						
HSP	43	49	56	54	44	15	25				
WHT	57	58	67	62	57	47	55				
FRL	42	49	64	53	52	39	22				
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	22	33	48	44	44	29	37				
ELL	33	48		44	70						
BLK	30	32		61	84		45				
HSP	48	56	63	59	70	50	57				
WHT	52	49	52	66	72	61	70				
FRL	48	50	52	64	73	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	31	51	56	38	57	64	50				
ELL	34	75		61	67						
BLK	29	60		52	47						
HSP	51	78	71	69	67	60	87				
WHT	66	62	65	70	63	75	63				
FRL	51	67	69	62	66	71	59				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	
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	58
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	47
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.

There were no 2020 state test scores. In reviewing 2019's scores, the learning gains among all students, including the bottom quartile, in math is low performing. Turnover in staff in math contributed to the decline.

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

The learning gains of 5th grade math students showed the greatest decline due to the turnover in that staff that was knowledgable of the standards.

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.

There is a gap among the ELL students. I believe this is because SES does not have a specific curriculum to address the needs of these students at that time.

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

4th grade ELA learning gains showed tremendous improvement. The reading coach spent several months collaboratively planning with the 4th grade ELA teachers, modeling lessons and facilitating data chats among students.

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

Attendance and ISS/OSS are of concern. We must establish strong parent contact this school year to catch issues before they develop into major problems.

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

1. math learning gains
2. ELA learning gains
3. science achievement
4. ELA achievement
5. math achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are working together to foster an anti-bias culture at SES. Through targeted PD and improving the racial representation of our children's media, we hope to have honest conversations with teachers and students so we are truly an anti-bias school.
Measurable Outcome:	The African-American population of students will score at or above this subgroup's state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SES will purchase diverse titles to share with teachers and provide PD on discussing racism with children. The anti-bias committee will serve as spearheads to provide training and facilitate discussions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All children need to feel safe and secure while at school.

Action Steps to Implement

Form anti-bias committee and purchase book to study with committee staff members.

Person Responsible	Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

Provide PD on discussing racism and differences with children.

Person Responsible	Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will participate in daily monitored independent reading practice. Additionally, teachers will hold daily reading conferences with students.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELA scores will improve.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer McCluskey (jennifer.mccluskey@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide PD to staff and perform fidelity to checks to observe and provide feedback on reading conferences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ultimately this helps children improve their reading but gives the teacher an individualized opportunity to work with that child and gain insight.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaboratively plan for rigorous, standards-based instruction in 4th and 5th grade ELA.

Person Responsible	Jennifer McCluskey (jennifer.mccluskey@okee.k12.fl.us)

Provide PD and feedback on reading conferences.

Person Responsible	Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Learners must be targeted and provided additional support in order to master the content. This subgroup should score at or above the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	The English Language Learner population of students will score at or above this subgroup's state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer McCluskey (jennifer.mccluskey@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using Language Power to differentiate instruction and provide explicit instruction to English Language Learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Another school in the District uses this program with fidelity and has seen an increase in the proficiency of their English Language Learner population.

Action Steps to Implement

Work with ELL para to assess and provide instruction on Language Power program. Monitor use of program with fidelity and provide feedback.

Person Responsible   Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities must be provided accommodations and provided differentiated instruction. This subgroup should score at or above the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	The student with disability population of students will score at or above this subgroup's state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The leadership team will be implementing a book study of UDL strategies to push out to their teams to provide better instruction to students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will participate in this implementation study with FIN and FDLRS because it is research-based and needed in order to improve our instruction to students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in UDL book study then provide PD to staff on instructional strategies to maximize learning for all students.

Person Responsible   Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our team will meet every 4-6 weeks to monitor tier 1, 2, 3 data and make improvements as necessary.

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.

This year, SES did a Google Form to seek parent interest in joining SAC or PFE. Over 65 parents completed this and have joined the Remind groups for these committees. Parents, staff, and community members will be invited to provide feedback regularly on our goals at SES.

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: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00