

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Alpha Charter Of Excellence



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	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Alpha Charter Of Excellence

1217 SW FOURTH ST, Miami, FL 33135

www.alpacharterschool.com

Demographics

Principal: Isabel Navas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Alpha Charter Of Excellence

1217 SW FOURTH ST, Miami, FL 33135

www.alpacharterschool.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 KG-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Alpha Charter of Excellence is to inspire all children to a life-long love of learning, excellence and academic success by maximizing student achievement through service learning activities and projects in a safe, nurturing and a Microsociety environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is to provide a quality education to all students and prepare them to compete in the global economy through the collaborative efforts of administrators, teachers, parents and the community.

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
Navas, Isabel	Principal	
Fernandez, Donna	Teacher, ESE	
Trujillo, Mabel	Instructional Coach	
Cuadra, Maria	Instructional Coach	
Uribe, Martha	Instructional Coach	Math / Content / Distance Learning
David, Claudia	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Isabel Navas

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	40	52	49	37	59	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	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	48%	62%	57%	41%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	62%	58%	58%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	58%	53%	57%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	69%	63%	49%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	66%	62%	65%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	55%	51%	64%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	55%	53%	35%	52%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
	2018	38%	61%	-23%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	64%	-19%	58%	-13%
	2018	47%	60%	-13%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	54%	60%	-6%	56%	-2%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	67%	-21%	62%	-16%
	2018	46%	67%	-21%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	69%	-3%	64%	2%
	2018	42%	68%	-26%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
	2018	43%	66%	-23%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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
ELL	44	54	59	51	63	56	43				
HSP	47	57	61	51	64	56	45				
FRL	47	56	61	51	64	56	45				
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
ELL	37	58	67	41	33	26	28				
HSP	46	61	71	44	36	25	40				
FRL	45	60	70	43	35	25	38				
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
ELL	33	55	57	46	64	64	27				
HSP	40	57	57	48	64	64	31				
FRL	41	60	62	49	64	62	38				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	55
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	
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	56
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
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.

Based on the Iready Reading AP3 test, the overall focus for this school year will be grades 3-4. The distant learning in the last quarter of the school year impacted our reading data. The school will focus on the following domains: Vocabulary and Comprehension.

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

Our rising third graders showed the greatest decline. The decline was based on distant learning. Our community really struggled with connectivity issues, parents were not aware how to use computers, students did not apply themselves to online teaching. The community was struggling due to COVID-19. Parents and students were impacted by the virus.

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.

The greatest gap is in Reading. The distant learning last quarter of the school year 2019-2020 really impacted negative the learning progress monitoring of the students.

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

Math Iready AP3 showed the most improvement in all grade levels except for third grade. The school had an intervention support personnel that assisted teachers and students in the classroom and virtually. Pull out and push in small groups took place daily. Student's data was monitored and tracked.

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

The area of concern will be engaging students the entire bell to bell schedule. Students are at home virtually learning and the school needs to communicate with parents constantly explaining the importance of staying engage. Students at home have a difficult time focusing on the learning task. Teachers must redirect student constantly in order to keep them engaged in learning.

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

1. Student Engagement
2. Enhancing the virtual learning environment
3. Progress Monitoring
4. Data Tracking
5. Teaching and learning in different formats (virtual and physical)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The domains to focus on will be vocabulary and comprehension. The goal is to increase student achievement by improving core instruction and keeping students engaged in both virtual and physical settings.

Measurable Outcome: The overall FSA proficiency level in Reading will be 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mabel Trujillo (934297@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies to Implement will be:
 1. Using Prior Knowledge / Previewing
 2. Predicting
 3. Context Clues
 4. Identifying main idea and summarization
 5. Higher order questioning
 6. Making inferences
 7. Visualizing (ELL students)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The teachers will be using these strategies to engage and assist students in learning. The teachers will be using explicit instruction to structure and sequence their lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

The teachers will be utilizing questioning techniques that engage the student. Coaches will be assisting classroom teachers and provide data chats. The students will be motivated to be engage in their zoom (Google Classroom). Lesson plans will include a variety of instructional techniques and activities. Positive feedback will be evident.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The domain the school will focus on is Algebra and Measurement. During the AP3 last school year, these two domains were the ones that needed most improvement.

Measurable Outcome: The FSA Proficiency level in Math will be 61%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Martha Uribe (925380@dadeschools.net)

The strategies the teachers will be focusing on are:

1. Measure lengths indirectly
2. Represent and interpret data
3. Estimate distances
4. Describe how measurements relate to size of a chosen unit
5. Students will be able to understand how to use ruler, yardsticks, meter sticks, etc.
6. Engage students with manipulatives and videos to create, explore, discover and analyze math problems.
7. Model real world situations by representing data in tables, and describing patterns.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need to be engaged in the virtual and physical setting. Using these strategies will provide students with different sensory activities to understand lessons better. Teachers will make learning fun as they use these identified strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

The teachers will be utilizing questioning techniques that engage the student. Coaches will be assisting classroom teachers and provide data chats. The students will be motivated to be engage in their zoom (Google Classroom). Lesson plans will include a variety of instructional techniques and activities. Positive feedback will be evident. Teachers will use videos and manipulatives for enriching the lesson.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The domains to focus on will be Earth, matter, energy, and human anatomy. The goal is to increase student achievement by improving core instruction and keeping students engaged in both virtual and physical settings.

Measurable Outcome: The overall FSA proficiency level in Science will be 55%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Martha Uribe (925380@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies the teachers will be focusing on are:
 1. Participating in the Science Fair Project so that students can develop their inquiry and investigation skills.
 2. Explain the human body parts and the importance of having a healthy body system.
 3. Explain the importance of the human body organs.
 4. Making inferences
 5. Visualizing (ELL students)
 6. Interpret data
 7. Students will be able to model Earth systems by completing a variety of projects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be using these and other strategies to assist students in learning. Students will be engaged in labs as well as projects. Teachers will make the virtual and physical setting a fun learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

The teachers will be utilizing questioning techniques that engage the student. Coaches will be assisting classroom teachers and provide data chats. The students will be motivated to be engage in their zoom (Google Classroom). Lesson plans will include a variety of instructional techniques and activities. Positive feedback will be evident. Teachers will use videos supporting labs and experiments.

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.

The leadership team will address the remaining school wide improvement policies by placing a distance learning plan. The plan consists of a user-friendly platform that targets the creating and grading assignments. The distance learning plan also consists of the use of educational programs that focus on each student's strengths and needs. The educational programs are iReady, Reflex Math, Imagine Learning, and Explore Learning.

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 addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by having EESAC meetings every two months to discuss school issues and improvements regarding the teachers and students. The ESSAC meetings consist of teachers, students, and parents and as a whole thrive to create an environment that informs and engages students. The ESSAC team aims to have to positive relationships among staff, parents, and students thus creating a safe place where ideas and concerns are welcomed and shared.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$172,582.00