
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	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Horizon Elementary School

2101 N PINE ISLAND RD, Sunrise, FL 33322

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Thaddeus Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2020

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	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 Broward 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	17

Horizon Elementary School

2101 N PINE ISLAND RD, Sunrise, FL 33322

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">92%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Every Child, Everyday, Whatever it takes!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Encourage, Educate, Excel.

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
Guy, Craig	Instructional Coach	To provide support to teachers in the subject areas of Math and Science in grades K-5.
Smith, Thaddeus	Principal	Student Achievement, Curriculum Program, School Budget, Safety and Security, Property and Inventory, Teacher feedback and professional growth. Communication to all stakeholders in the educational community.
Rippo, Kristi	Assistant Principal	Student Achievement, Curriculum Program, School Budget, Safety and Security, Property and Inventory, Incentive Programs, Discipline, Teacher feedback and professional growth. Communication to all stakeholders in the educational community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/21/2020, Thaddeus Smith

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

35

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	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	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	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

Monday 9/21/2020

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	79	84	95	82	107	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	13	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	20	15	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	1	1	10	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	3	4	3	8	14	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	79	84	95	82	107	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	13	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	15	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	1	1	10	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	3	4	3	8	14	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	61%	59%	57%	51%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	60%	58%	45%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	65%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	66%	62%	57%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	53%	51%	44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	46%	53%	48%	45%	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	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	62%	8%	58%	12%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	67%	5%	64%	8%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	48%	64%	-16%	60%	-12%
	2018	50%	62%	-12%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
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	29	37	35	31	28	31	23				
ELL	58	60	53	60	51	20	40				
ASN	90			90							
BLK	57	62	56	58	53	32	24				
HSP	60	52	43	66	58	23	50				
MUL	46			46							
WHT	79	88		71	69						
FRL	61	63	54	61	58	33	36				
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	31	36	32	27	43	46	26				
ELL	40	50	53	44	53	38	33				
ASN	82			100							
BLK	60	55	43	54	54	48	53				
HSP	53	55	47	58	57	38	33				
MUL	69	70		69	60						
WHT	63	58		74	74		62				
FRL	59	56	42	59	56	41	52				
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	16	25	28	20	34	38	7				
ELL	19	19	29	45	48						
BLK	43	40	46	44	46	41	40				
HSP	52	53	38	64	66	50	60				
WHT	64	40		69	68		40				
FRL	46	41	38	51	50	39	44				

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	53
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	50
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	90
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	50
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	51

Hispanic Students	
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	46
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	77
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	53
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 area was Students with Disabilities. The contributing factors included students misdiagnosed, 5th grade students under performing, and lack of home support. (2018-2019 school year data)

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

Lowest quartile in Math Learning gains decreased by 15 % points. The contributing factors included students misdiagnosed, 5th grade students under performing, under use of Math ILS, and lack of home support. (2018-2019 school year data)

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.

Lowest quartile in Math Learning gains decreased by 15 % points. The contributing factors included students misdiagnosed, under use of Math ILS, and lack of home support. (2018-2019 school year data)

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

Lowest quartile in ELA increased the most. The actions we added were LLI pull out groups, , FSA Camp, and increased usage of ILS. (2018-2019 school year)

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

The area of concern would be students who scored a level 1 on statewide assessments from the 2018-2019 school year. This was due to Covid-19 pandemic. (No FSA testing 2019-2020 school year)

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

1. Professional Development in grades K-5 for teachers that service SWD
2. Small group instruction in Math/ELA for SWD
3. Progress monitoring in Math/ELA/Science
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Students in grades 3-5

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Integration of ELA in Science. There was a decline in our Science scores of 17% (2019)
---	--

Measurable Outcome: Increase our Science scores to 50% or higher on State testing in Spring of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Stemscope assessments/i-ready ELA standards testing

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Stemscores is aligned with Florida Standards and gives teachers tools to support students' specific needs. Science A-Z will address ELA and science needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff Professional Development
2. Vertical Teaming/Planning
3. Target areas of concern
4. Progress monitoring
5. Reteach/Celebrate

Person Responsible Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

#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 action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our students with disabilities population did not meet FSA expectations. (2019)

Measurable Outcome: The goal is that by May 2021, our SWD subgroup will increase by 20% higher than the 2019 FSA scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies being used are LLI, STAM, Wilson and Heggerty resources, iReady Teacher Toolbox and Go Math Reteach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These research-based resources align with the Florida State Standards and have been proven to help build student stamina and bring them to grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff Professional Development
2. Vertical Teaming/Planning
3. Target Areas of Concern
4. Progress Monitoring
5. Reteach/Celebrate

Person Responsible Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership team will address the needs of SWD students by providing various webinars/professional learning for teachers to attend in the area of SWD. Teachers will have additional access to tools, resources, and strategies to provide better services for our SWD population. Leadership will also communicate more clearly with parents so they understand the importance of their child's education. Giving parents/students additional resources will aid us in increasing our overall school scores for the 2020-2021 school year.

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 mission at Horizon Elementary is Every Child, Every Day, Whatever It Takes! This same mission applies to all of the many stakeholders at Horizon Elementary. Our goal is to be sure that all stakeholders see Horizon as their second and sometimes even first home. It is here, where we create a community that respects each and everyone's individualism. We promote equity within our school building and outside to our families as well. Virtual school wide activities for all stakeholders include: SAC meetings, the Annual Title 1 Public Meeting, Grade Level Open House, Meetings regarding Curriculum and Instruction, and the Title I Parent University provided by the County. Parent links, Class Dojo and CANVAS Announcements with information about upcoming events, school counselor SEL and mindfulness series, as well as locations of food distribution for families suffering during the COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders are very important to the Horizon family. We have an open door policy for communications with all of our Horizon family members.

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: Other: Students in grades 3-5				\$1,893.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	239-Other	2531 - Horizon Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,893.00
<i>Notes: Materials to Improve SWD scores on the FSA 2021</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$2,001.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	2531 - Horizon Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,001.00
<i>Notes: Funding for Substitute Teachers for Professional Development</i>						
Total:						\$3,894.00