

Polk County Public Schools

Berkley Accelerated



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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Berkley Accelerated

5316 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bams>

Demographics

Principal: Jill Bolender

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2004

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 6-10
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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

N/A

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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Berkley Accelerated

5316 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bams>

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)
Combination School 6-10	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	32%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

BAMS is committed to inspiring our students to Believe in Better, to encourage them to aspire to higher learning, and challenge them to achieve their maximum individual potential while providing a supportive and safe educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Believe in BETTER!"

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
Bolender, Jill	Principal	
Sawyer, Brian	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Amber	Teacher, ESE	
Widner, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	
Figueroa, Ana	Teacher, ESE	
Walker, Loren	Teacher, K-12	
Robinson, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	
Tapp, Carrie	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2004, Jill Bolender

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.*

4

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 6-10
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	151	150	0	0	0	0	461	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	22	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	0	0	0	0	23	
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	10	10	12	0	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	14	

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	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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

Monday 6/22/2020

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	167	158	156	0	0	0	0	481	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	20	0	0	0	0	52	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	0	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	13	0	0	0	0	35	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	167	158	156	0	0	0	0	481
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	20	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	13	0	0	0	0	35

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	74%	61%	61%	70%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	58%	59%	61%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	49%	54%	52%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	86%	61%	62%	88%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	59%	68%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	52%	70%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	52%	56%	65%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	79%	78%	83%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)					Total
	6	7	8	9	10	
	(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	69%	48%	21%	54%	15%
	2018	69%	41%	28%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	79%	42%	37%	52%	27%
	2018	61%	42%	19%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	75%	48%	27%	56%	19%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	58%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	91%	47%	44%	55%	36%
	2018	90%	40%	50%	52%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	75%	39%	36%	54%	21%
	2018	81%	40%	41%	54%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2019	73%	35%	38%	46%	27%
	2018	73%	34%	39%	45%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	65%	41%	24%	48%	17%
	2018	63%	42%	21%	50%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	70%	17%	71%	16%
2018	77%	84%	-7%	71%	6%
Compare		10%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	50%	49%	61%	38%
2018	99%	60%	39%	62%	37%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	53%	43%	57%	39%
2018	85%	41%	44%	56%	29%
Compare		11%			

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	22	56	50	39	33	9					
ELL	75	75		58	54						
ASN	94	76		100	76						
BLK	55	61	57	76	64	53	42	55	45		
HSP	79	76	68	81	68	50	63	87	60		
MUL	63	44		81	69						
WHT	74	72	60	88	60	57	66	89	67		
FRL	66	65	60	82	65	52	54	80	52		
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	14	33	33	43	71	65					
ELL	38	54		77	77						
ASN	91	64		100	45						
BLK	54	56	43	71	59	67		77			
HSP	66	62	53	91	62	83	62	75	69		
MUL	69	62		69	46						
WHT	68	55	41	86	62	71	63	78	61		
FRL	58	55	40	80	56	65	57	64	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	25	38	33	54	50	47					
ELL	30	30		50	70						
ASN	85	69		100	85						
BLK	43	57	57	67	72	63	25		27		
HSP	75	61	52	91	69	83	72	95	76		
MUL	56	63		88	75						
WHT	71	61	51	89	66	70	71	79	71		
FRL	57	54	50	81	69	72	51	74	54		

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	70
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	628

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	66
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	87
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	56
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	70
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	70
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	64
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.

Math- lowest 25% and ESE

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

Change in staff.

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.

No component had a negative gap compared to the state average.

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

ELA- Change in staff and emphasis on writing.

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

Students with 10%+ absences.

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

1. Math ESE
2. Math Lowest 25%
3. Engagement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will implement highly effective strategies to deliver instruction based on math Florida Standards in order to increase student proficiency and specifically the lowest 25% and SWDs.
---	---

Measurable Outcome:	SWD will increase proficiency on Math FSA to at least 41%.
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.net)
---	---

Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating trauma sensitive classrooms.
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By creating trauma sensitive classrooms, teachers will build relationships to help foster growth in SWD.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development on Trauma Sensitive classrooms by Sept. 1 2019 (Jensen, YMHFA training, NCSC, Pre-Planning training)
2. Ron Clark Professional Development Days by Jan. 30, 2020
3. Progress Monitoring Data Analysis- on-going/quarterly
4. Math Coaching- weekly
5. Lesson Plan and Classroom Observation- on-going/weekly

Person Responsible	Ana Figueroa (ana.figueroa@berkleymiddle.net)
---------------------------	---

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will implement highly effective strategies to build a Trauma Sensitive School (TSS) through building relationships with all students. Rationale In order to create a healthy framework that addresses the need for the whole child; the creation of a trauma sensitive campus will enable students to reach their full academic potential.
Measurable Outcome:	Continued growth for all subgroups, and an increase of SWD in ESSA to at least 41% growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To create a trauma sensitive campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to create a healthy framework that addresses the need for the whole child; the creation of a trauma sensitive campus will enable students to reach their full academic potential.

Action Steps to Implement

1. In weekly PLC meetings, team leaders will discuss and review strategies being implemented in Strength and Conditioning to ensure accountability- ongoing weekly.
2. Professional Development training (Jensen, National Charter School Conference, YMHFA, Pre-Planning days)- by September 1st, 2019.
3. Ron Clark Professional Development training- by January 30th, 2020.
4. Lesson plans and classroom observations- ongoing weekly

Person Responsible Loren Walker (loren.walker@berkleymiddle.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers will actively teach rigorous text complexity reading skills in all classes. This will be addressed through the following ways:

1. Professional Development- Florida Summer Literacy Institute and Pre- planning days
2. Weekly PLC shared grade level meetings
3. Evidenced by lesson plans and classroom observations

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.

BAMS utilizes a robust communication plan.

Strategies and initiatives include but are not limited to:

School "BAMily" emails for all families

Notify Parents of emergencies, changes to normal operations through BAMily emails,

Remind text notifications, and social media platforms

Welcome incoming students and families tours and open house nights.

Help students and families know about upcoming school year.

Inform families of Orientation date/time.

Inform families of policies and rules.

Keep students and informed of ongoing activities.

Keep students and parents informed on their grades and attendance.

Facilitate easy location of school information.

Inform students and parents of class objectives.

Open House for all families.

Communicate student specific concerns with a parent.

Personal interaction for answering parent questions about school.

Attain opinions of stakeholders through surveys that are used as data for the Parent

Advisory Committee.

Promote school mission and goals of school through print, social media, email, clothing, and events that focus on the growth mindset, character education, and a belief in better.

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				\$11,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	330-Travel	8142 - Berkley Accelerated	Title II		\$8,000.00
	6400	500-Materials and Supplies	8142 - Berkley Accelerated	General Fund		\$3,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$11,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	6400	330-Travel	8142 - Berkley Accelerated	Title II		\$8,000.00
	6400	500-Materials and Supplies	8142 - Berkley Accelerated	General Fund		\$3,000.00
Total:						\$22,000.00