

Bay District Schools

Southport Elementary School



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

Southport Elementary School

1835 BRIDGE ST, Southport, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Harless

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Southport Elementary School

1835 BRIDGE ST, Southport, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	12%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Southport Elementary School is committed to creating a safe learning environment which maximizes every student's potential in a setting where excellence in academics and the arts is accomplished by emphasizing patriotism and character development of the individual in a school culture of respect and civility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower and strengthen each child in body, mind, and spirit to prepare them to influence this community's future and become key contributors, leaders, and exemplary global citizens in the 21st century.

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
Harless, Todd	Principal	
Anderson, Cayla	Teacher, K-12	
Gilder, Joan	Teacher, ESE	
Ramsey, Amanda`	School Counselor	
Lewis, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	
Stukey, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Kelley, Sally	Teacher, K-12	
Infinger, Savannah	Teacher, K-12	
Gingrich, Leanne	Teacher, K-12	
Averett, Amber	Teacher, PreK	
Reeder, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	
Eckles, Stacie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Michael Harless

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

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)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	69	64	74	71	63	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	10	4	8	11	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	5	8	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	6	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/29/2020

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	70	74	66	60	61	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	16	18	10	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	5	8	0	0	0	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	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	70	74	66	60	61	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	16	18	10	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	5	8	0	0	0	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	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	51%	55%	57%	55%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	59%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	53%	50%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	56%	63%	58%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	36%	54%	62%	65%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	6%	42%	51%	61%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	53%	53%	45%	44%	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	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	56%	0%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	59%	-10%	64%	-15%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	74%	54%	20%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
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	25	37	57	25	22	7	39				
WHT	52	55	54	50	36	4	58				
FRL	40	48	52	36	30	8	51				
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	21	43	53	38	44	37	47				
WHT	49	53	57	63	60	38	72				
FRL	41	54	58	53	59	46	68				
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	33	45	47	26	58	59	38				
WHT	55	59	48	58	64	61	46				
FRL	46	51	48	50	59	58	40				

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	44
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	44
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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% (6%), Math Learning Gains (36%)

The contributing factors for the previous year, since there was no testing in 19/20, include having less time to teach due to Hurricane Michael and helping students adjust to their "new normal. The traumatic experience was a challenge for the mental health of students and staff and certainly affected achievement and learning gains.

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

Math lowest 25% dropped from 43% to 6%, Math Learning Gains dropped from 61% to 36%, Math Achievement dropped from 63% to 48%, Science Achievement dropped from 74% to 58%. The contributing factors were that teachers had less time to teach due to Hurricane Michael. The focus was on required skills and concepts rather than spiral reviews, thinking skills, and testing strategies.

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 Lowest 25%

Students in our bottom quartile most often need additional support, additional time, and flexibility to complete complex or academically challenging assignments. Due to the lost time and mental health concerns due to Hurricane Michael recovery, instructional time was limited.

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

ELA Achievement 51% increased from 48%

Small group instruction and interventions were provided during ELA.

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

Our SWD are having a difficult time understanding math skills and concepts. Making growth in this area is extremely challenging for them. Additionally, our economically disadvantaged students made a significant drop in math that year. These two groups are cause for great concern and blueprint has been created to guide the improvement of these groups.

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

1. Lowest 25% Math Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Math Achievement
4. ELA Achievement
5. Lowest 25% ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of Focus Description: Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains
Rationale: The results of the 2019 FSA indicate this area of critical need. Our Math Lowest 25% dropped from 43% to 6%.

Measurable Outcome: Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in Math will increase to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be utilized to analyze multiple data sources to determine standards-based resources to prepare and provide small-group, differentiated instruction,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated, small-group instruction will allow us to work more individually with students and quickly adjust instruction based on the data we collect.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize PLCs to analyze multiple data sources and use standards-based resources to prepare and provide differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilize coaches to assist teachers with curriculum and content in the classroom.

Person Responsible Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

Grade level liaison meetings will assist with barriers and challenges.

Person Responsible Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

Online resources will be provided for students and parents including Newsletters, Canvas, First in Math, and Zearn.

Person Responsible Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilize "catch-up" paras in order to provide support to instruction

Person Responsible Todd Harless (harlem@bay.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus	Area of Focus: Student Social-Emotional Competency
Description and Rationale:	Rationale: Incorporating social and emotional components into our instructional practice will help motivate students to engage in the learning process.
Measurable Outcome:	Discipline Referrals will decrease by 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school-wide Character Education program will be used and emphasised daily: Core Essentials and Keeping the Promise.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through the use of evidence-based strategies which are embedded in the Core Essentials and Keeping the Promise programs, we will improve social-emotional competency.

Action Steps to Implement

Embed a school-wide Character Education program that is used and emphasized daily-Core Essentials and Keeping the Promise.

Person Responsible Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Work in conjunction with the Children's Advocacy Center and Bay District Schools to provide student and teacher training in Child Safety Matters and Life Skills.

Person Responsible Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Threat Assessment Team will meet monthly to review student data and create individual behavior and action plans as needed.

Person Responsible Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

PROMISE-grant behavior para, and an additional preventative behavior para will be provided and will teach strategic behavior interventions.

Person Responsible Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Classroom supports (including the mental health triad, SES mentor program, Elevate Bay mentor program) will be provided to students who display a need for additional support. The mental health triad will offer supports such as CICO, lunch bunch, and social skills groups. Mentors will provide mentorship to selected students throughout the school year, using social and academic goals.

Person Responsible Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school will be working on school safety and security by updating safety plans, maps, and practicing drills in accordance with the most recent state mandates during COVID-19. We will continue to foster our relationships with all stakeholders and our service members until we can resume our regular flag-raising ceremonies and parent involvement activities.

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.

Due to COVID-19, we are unable to resume our normal activities at the time of the SIP submission. However, during our normal school year, we build and foster relationships and increase parent involvement through the following activities:

Orientation
Open House
Curriculum Night for 3rd Grade
Parental Workshops
Winter Festival
Book Fair
Awards Ceremonies
Service Projects and Student Council
Flag Raising Ceremonies
PTO and SAC Meetings
Parent-Teacher Conferences

At the time of the SIP submission, we are holding many of these activities virtually, including awards, PTO and SAC meetings, conferences, and parent workshops for Canvas training and questions.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00