

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Academir Charter School Preparatory



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Academir Charter School Preparatory

19185 SW 127TH AVE, Miami, FL 33177

www.academircharterschoolpreparatory.com

Demographics

Principal: Mary Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	80%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: No Grade
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

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Academir Charter School Preparatory

19185 SW 127TH AVE, Miami, FL 33177

www.academircharterschoolpreparatory.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>85%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

School Grades History

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

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 AcadeMir Charter School Preparatory is to provide students with a well grounded Kindergarten through Eighth grade school education through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science using innovative, reform based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Academir Charter School Preparatory is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curriculum enabling students to be well prepared for life through adherence to the mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

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
Ledo, Mary Kristina	Principal	Oversee all safety Security and Compliance. The principal drives instruction and disseminates data by observing trends and making continuous improvement decisions based on data in the following areas: academics, curriculum, accountability, safety, personnel, fiscal, coaching, and students services.
Plantada, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in all functions. Oversees intervention, tutoring, discipline, Title 3, Student Support services, gradebook K-7
Schmitt, Marianela	Instructional Coach	Mathematics Instructional coach, data, lesson planning, modeling,
Carreno, Nicole	SAC Member	EESAC Chairperson
Triana, Marianne	Assistant Principal	Administrator of Middle grades and Title 1
Tabares, Erica	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and Professional Development
Pierre-Louis, Dominique	Instructional Coach	Science and Content Areas
Taylor, Amanda	Instructional Technology	Google platforms

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Mary Gonzalez

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

67

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	80%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: No Grade
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	130	130	180	146	180	96	80	44	0	0	0	0	0	986
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	15	7	11	20	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	9	10	1	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	1	2	2	5	14	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	25	0	4	25	34	18	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	12	5	5	16	28	15	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Friday 9/11/2020

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	133	181	143	181	99	110	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	896
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	4	2	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	15	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	8	2	12	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	133	181	143	181	99	110	123	44	0	0	0	0	0	1014
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	4	2	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	15	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	8	2	12	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	63%	63%	61%	49%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	61%	59%	72%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	57%	54%	84%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	61%	67%	62%	57%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	63%	59%	57%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	56%	52%	34%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	59%	56%	56%	71%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	56%	6%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	67%	-2%	62%	3%
	2018	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	69%	-12%	64%	-7%
	2018	65%	68%	-3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	58%	65%	-7%	60%	-2%
	2018	60%	66%	-6%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	53%	6%	53%	6%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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					
2018					
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					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	42	47	24	42	50	18				
ELL	55	61	63	52	49	45	45				
BLK	47	20		53	40						
HSP	64	65	68	61	56	46	60				
FRL	61	62	67	61	54	43	53				
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	23	69	75	59	81						
ELL	53	73	78	56	71	73	60				
BLK	46	70		38	50						
HSP	57	72	79	64	71	72	70				
FRL	55	71	81	63	70	74	69				

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	21			32							
ELL	38	68	77	51	56	31	71				
BLK	38			58							
HSP	50	72	88	57	55	33	73				
FRL	47	70	82	56	53	36	68				

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	60
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	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	40
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	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
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	59
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.

Data is from the 2018-2019 school year indicates that math is the component with the lowest performance. More generic progress monitoring and not disseminating the domains across all students. Less over site as it pertains to populations and subgroups that make up 50% of lowest 25% population.

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

Math Learning gain in the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the previous 2 years. More generic progress monitoring and not disseminating the domains across all students. Less over site as it pertains to populations and subgroups that make up 50% of lowest 25% population.

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.

Math learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest gap. More generic progress monitoring and not disseminating the domains across all students. Less over site as it pertains to populations and subgroups that make up 50% of lowest 25% population.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement or consistency in positive trends. Continuous progress monitoring across standards and a renewed focus on writing in grades 4 and 5.

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

Math Learning gains and those of the 2 subgroups SWDs and students who identify as black are potential areas for concern. The school is also focused on improving the number of students who are absent MORE than 10 times in a year.

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

1. Learning Gains in >25 in mathematics
2. Learning Gains in mathematics Overall
3. Science Proficiency
4. Civics Proficiency
5. Maintaining ELA proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math learning gains will be focused on during the 2020-2021 school year and is a critical area of need because focusing on Math LG will also affect the lowest 25% a critical need area as it pertains to subgroup performance.

Measurable Outcome: ACSP will achieve 65% or higher LG in Mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Kristina Ledo (mkledo@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent Progress Monitoring with a renewed focus on number and operations as well as Algebraic Thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Both domains were the lowest domains as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA results and encompass over 50% of test items.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased Math Learning Gains in SWDs subgroup, because 50% of the lowest 25% population are students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of students with disabilities will show a learning gain in mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Taylor (tayloram@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent Progress Monitoring with a renewed focus on number and operations as well as Algebraic Thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Both domains were the lowest domains as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA results and encompass over 50% of test items.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased Math Learning Gains in the lowest 25%in African American subgroup, because 100% of the African American students are also the lowest 25% population
Measurable Outcome:	70% of the lowest 25 will make a learning gain in Mathematics
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marianela Schmitt (mschmitt@academircharterschoolpreparatory.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent Progress Monitoring with a renewed focus on number and operations as well as Algebraic Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Both domains were the lowest domains as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA results and encompass over 50% of test items.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An increased attention to small group instruction and alignment to standards combined with continuous progress monitoring.

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.

Providing multi-layered support across instructional and operation strategies. ACSP also is committed to our positive behavioral support model as well as currently re-vamped a progressive discipline plan to address positive school culture.

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: Math				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1015 - Academir Charter School Preparatory			\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring for lowest 25% will begin in October</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$0.00
					Total:	\$10,000.00