

Polk County Public Schools

Garden Grove Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

<http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove>

Demographics

Principal: Laura Neidringhaus

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	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 (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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 is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

<http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove>

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	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Believing all children can learn, we will work together in a safe and caring environment, guiding each individual toward lifelong learning and responsible productive citizens..

Provide the school's vision statement.

Garden Grove Elementary School will dedicate its leadership and resources to creating a positive learning environment based on research and high-yield strategies. Decisions on instruction will be data-driven using formative and summative data. Teachers will be expected to follow curriculum maps. Tier II and Tier III will be provided for students that are below level, have not mastered grade level standards, and are at-risk. Remediation will be provided for all students that have not mastered a particular skill.

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
Bergwall, Shauna	Principal	The Principal will oversee all instructional decisions and intervention data as well as school operations.
Greene, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Reading Interventionist
Smith, Susan	Instructional Coach	Collaborative Planning and PLCs
Bearden, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assists Principal for all school duties, oversees teachers' book study
Burkholder, Brooke	School Counselor	School Counselor, MTSS Coordinator, LEA
Roberts, Pamala	Teacher, ESE	Gifted teacher, PBIS School Contact

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Laura Neidringhaus

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

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)	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 (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	113	91	83	83	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	13	15	8	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	9	7	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	18	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	5	9	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	5	9	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	106	87	81	83	77	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	8	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	12	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
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	106	87	81	83	77	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	8	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	12	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
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	53%	51%	57%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	51%	58%	44%	53%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	53%	26%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	57%	63%	60%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	47%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	51%	36%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	35%	46%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	51%	47%	4%	56%	-5%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	56%	-11%	64%	-19%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	65%	51%	14%	60%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	56%	12%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	45%	3%	53%	-5%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	31	33		31	43	36	27				
ELL	20	50		40	50	50					
BLK	30	44	41	36	38	41	6				
HSP	49	54		57	54	55	64				
MUL	64			91							
WHT	64	56	45	74	67	57	60				
FRL	44	51	45	51	54	50	42				
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	34	55	54	35	36	36	10				
ELL	7			43							
BLK	25	43	54	47	46	40	22				
HSP	62	73		66	79		74				
MUL	62			85							
WHT	64	52	54	75	55	45	63				
FRL	43	54	53	63	57	57	49				
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	25	25	42	38	29	7				
ELL	22	21		50	50						
BLK	28	30	26	34	29	33	9				
HSP	56	45		60	50		39				
WHT	59	46	9	71	51	31	45				

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
FRL	44	41	32	53	45	46	28				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	
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	34
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	59
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	78
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	60
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.

The lowest performing component was the LG of the L25 in ELA/Math. The contributing factor is the lack of standards-based, small-group instruction to close learning gaps. The school has a history of not making gains with the L25.

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

Fourth grade math proficiency showed the greatest decline. The factor that contributed to the decline was the lack of focus on math instruction (no school-based coach nor support from district-based coach).

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.

Fourth grade math proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factor that contributed to the decline was the lack of focus on math instruction (no school-based coach nor support from district-based coach).

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

Third grade math showed the most improvement. The action that contributed to this was a strong teacher selection for third grade math instruction.

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

1. Attendance in grades K-2
2. Proficiency in ELA/Math in grades 3-5

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

1. Standards-based collaborative planning for whole-group and small-group instruction
2. Improving relationships between staff and students
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a need for standards-based collaborative planning for whole-group and small-group instruction. By planning rigorous, standards-based tasks and implementing those in the classroom, student achievement will increase. The area was identified as a critical need based on proficiency, learning gains and L25 learning gains from the 2018 to 2019 FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Students will show a 5% gain in ELA/Math proficiency, LG and L25 LG from the 2019 to 2021 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional coaches in ELA/Math will facilitate research-based collaborative planning sessions. The school employs a literacy coach and will fund a math contact from Title I funds. Both coach and contact will work with AP to ensure effective coaching strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on historical data, there was a need identified for strong instructional leadership and planning. The implementation of regular and focused planning sessions will ensure task completion.

Action Steps to Implement

AP will meet with Literacy Coach and Math Contact during Summer 2020 to plan for coaching for 20-21 school year.

Person Responsible Melissa Bearden (melissa.bearden@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning will take place weekly for ELA and Math. ELA will take place during teacher planning times and Math will take place after school and will be funded by Title I.

Person Responsible Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

All allotted professional development times will be devoted to PLC work to analyze student work samples and plan for instruction to close achievement gaps. In addition, after-school PLCs will take place every other week and be funded by Title I.

Person Responsible Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

Two instructional paraprofessionals will be hired to work with students in L25 of grades 3-5 under the direction of the school's reading interventionist. All small-group instruction will be guided by data.

Person Responsible Shauna Bergwall (shauna.bergwall@polk-fl.net)

The gifted teacher will pull small groups of on-level and above-level students to work on ELA/Math skills and monitor their progress (learning gains).

Person Responsible Pamala Roberts (pamala.roberts@polk-fl.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No description entered***Person Responsible** [no one identified]*No description entered***Person Responsible** [no one identified]**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

In order for any improvement to occur, relationships between students and staff must improve. A book study with Google Classroom reflection piece will be organized by AP and funded by Title I/ school funds.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The school hosts a Facebook page that highlights positive school events. In addition, the schoolwide Class Dojo will allow for comprehensive communication to all parents that can be translated into home languages for ease of access. This year, the school administration will organize a book study for teachers to increase understanding of the importance of relationships with students and working with students of poverty. The school partners with local businesses to fund projects that increase staff morale and build teacher resource supplies.

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					\$52,019.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	6400	100-Salaries	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,745.00	
			Notes: Includes Math Contact and attending teacher pay for Collaborative Planning and PLCs (after school).				
	7300	510-Supplies	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	General Fund		\$500.00	
			Notes: To fund books/materials/resources for teacher book study				
	5100	100-Salaries	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$47,774.00	
			Notes: Salaries for two instructional paraprofessionals to work with students in L25 in ELA/ Math				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:					\$0.00
Total:						\$52,019.00	