Manatee County Public Schools

Parrish Community High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parrish Community High School

11601 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

https://www.manateeschools.net/parrish

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Bradshaw

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Manatee 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

Parrish Community High School

11601 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

https://www.manateeschools.net/parrish

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)
High School 9-12	No	28%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Parrish Community provides a safe and supportive environment, focused on academic excellence, social awareness, and community involvement while creating innovative learners who are inspired to meet local and global challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Parrish Community's vision is to provide a safe and supportive environment where all stakeholders are respected and inspired. Students are driven to possess social awareness, civic responsibility, and aspire for personal growth. Working together with parents, families, and business partners Parrish Community is committed to using innovative technology and authentic pathways to drive college and career readiness to empower students as they develop into citizens in an ever-expanding global 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
Little, Craig	Principal	Mr. Little oversees and coordinates instruction, academics, educational initiatives, administrative activities, and other happenings at the school site to ensure the school adheres to State and District policies and initiatives while upholding the mission and vision.
Ansbro, Diana	School Counselor	Mrs. Ansbro leads the school counselors in coordinating and implementing research-based practices for speaking with students and families.
Champagne, Paul	Assistant Principal	Mr. Champagne assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of SAC.
Cummins, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Cummins is the Reading Department Lead and Growth Mindset Professional Development Coordinator for the school.
Dietz, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Dietz is the Math Department Lead and is actively involved in sponsoring the Student Government Association.
Gagnon, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Gagnon assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT).
Grainger, Susan	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mrs. Grainger is the CTE Department Lead.
Licata, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Licata is the English Department Lead.
Novarro, Erin	Other	Mrs. Novarro is the school's Testing Coordinator and helps analyze testing data.
Paternostro, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Paternostro is the school's ESE Department Lead and assists with monitoring progress towards accreditation.
Spivey, Erin	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Coach Spivey is a Physical Education teacher at the school site and involved with Athletic Boosters.
Wright, Allison	Dean	Ms. Wright is the MTSS/IST Chair, 504 Coordinator, and SIP Committee Chair. She is also responsible for monitoring student behavior and addressing as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 1/1/2019, Daniel Bradshaw

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

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	465	407	237	0	1109
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	54	39	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	7	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	78	33	0	117
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	47	50	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	25	25	0	93

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	47	59	42	0	148

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		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	363	195	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	67	0	0	129

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	8	24	0	0	32

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363	195	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	67	0	0	129

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	8	24	0	0	32

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	
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	0%	49%	56%	0%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	47%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	52%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	47%	48%	0%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	45%	0%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	67%	68%	0%	73%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	73%	0%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
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
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
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

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

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.

Although Parrish Community High School does not have Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data from the previous two years, the most recent data compiled from semester exams and from the 2018-2019 FSA assessments demonstrate that the data component with the lowest performance is the bottom quartile gains in ELA and learning gains in Math. A possible explanation for this is that PCHS did not have any reliable data from previous years as a new school to determine proper supports for these students.

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

The biggest decline from last years' 2018-2019 data to the most recent data from the 2019-2020 school year was in Math Achievement and Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains, both having declined.

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 largest gap occurred in a positive manner - PCHS' Social Studies achievement was 100% on Semester exams compared to the 2018-2019 data. This difference can be attributed to a smaller cohort of high-performing students taking US History as sophomores.

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

There was a 27% increase in the Social Studies achievement scores from 2018-2019 and the actual achievement scores from Semester 1. As stated, our US History course was a small cohort of high-achieving students.

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

Areas of concern based on the Early Warning Systems data are the percentage of students with two or more risk indicators and the number of students with a course failure in math, at 13% and 11% of the school's population respectively.

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains
3. English Language Arts Bottom Quartile Learning Gains
4. Students with Two or More EWS Indicators
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A focus on instructional practice, as related to Math, will help with the ability for high-quality teachers to provide and assist students with standards-based instruction and learning opportunities. The information from PCHS' Semester Exams, Progress Monitoring, and the 2018-2019 school grade data from the previous year demonstrate that math learning gains should be an area of focus.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 5% increase from the 2019 state average of 48% in learning gains of students taking a Math End Of Course (EOC) Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent assessments of learning through collaboratively created Progress Monitoring during Department Meetings and PLCs. Analysis of trends through ILT. Small group standards-based instruction targeting weaknesses as demonstrated through assessments. The use of ALEKS, a self-guided artificial intelligence system for instruction and remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs and ILTs are proven research-based approaches that are implemented nationally to improve instructional practices and monitor student learning. ALEKS is a proven system to help students grow in their knowledge of math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student data will be collected and analyzed for trends through Department Meetings and PLCS.
2. Teachers will collaborate to create assessments to monitor student achievement towards the standards for the courses.
3. Teachers will collaboratively analyze the data and adjust instruction and pacing as needed.
4. Data will be brought to ILT for feedback and input, and to determine school-wide trends.

Person Responsible	Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A focus on instructional practice, as related to ELA, will help with the ability for high-quality teachers to provide and assist students with standards-based instruction and learning opportunities. The information from PCHS' Semester Exams, Progress Monitoring, and 2018-2019 school grade data from the previous year demonstrate that ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile should be a focus.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 3% increase from the 2018-2019 data in the learning gains of the bottom-quartile students taking the English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent assessments of learning through collaboratively created Progress Monitoring during Department Meetings and PLCs. Analysis of trends through ILT. Small group standards-based instruction targeting weaknesses as demonstrated through assessments. The use of Reading Plus and Khan Academy, self-guided artificial intelligence systems for instruction and remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs and ILTs are proven research-based approaches that are implemented nationally to improve instructional practices and monitor student learning. Reading Plus and Khan Academy are proven systems to help students grow in their knowledge of Reading and English.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student data will be collected and analyzed for trends through Department Meetings and PLCS.
2. Teachers will collaborate to create assessments to monitor student achievement towards the standards for the courses.
3. Teachers will collaboratively analyze the data and adjust instruction and pacing as needed.
4. Data will be brought to ILT for feedback and input, and to determine school-wide trends.

Person Responsible	Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Early Warning Systems data, there is a demonstrated need for extra supports for the 13% of the student population exhibiting two or more indicators of being at-risk for graduation. Particularly, the 11th grade has a large percentage of students with two or more indicators at 18%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, every student in the Early Warning System (EWS) will have been accurately identified through the creation of an implementation of a tracking system and each student in the EWS will be given the proper interventions to help support their education.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Wright (wright2a@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through MTSS, determine tiered levels of ct-offs for at-risk students and decide on research-based intervention based on student-need. Meet two times a month to review data, implement interventions as necessary, and problem-solve with stakeholders as needed. Implement a teacher mentor program, where teachers will check-in on specific students in an effort to help them build relationships on campus and advocate for student needs. Review data information with ILT monthly and gain feedback for improvements and involvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students feel connected to the school they attend, they are less likely to exhibit behaviors that can be detrimental to their ability to graduate. By providing ways to connect through mentoring, lunch and learns, and contracts, students will become more successful. Using the MTSS/IST framework for students who are at risk will allow for individualized interventions as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaboratively create tiered intervention cut-off pyramids for when to move students to different tiers for academics, behavior, and attendance, and create interventions for specific behaviors.
2. Bi-monthly data pull for behavior and attendance data of students and meet to discuss with MTSS/IST.
3. Progress reports analysis for students with D/F grades in ILT to be brought to Department Meetings and MTSS/IST if needed.
4. Collaborate with departments through the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) to monitor students who are at-risk and develop solutions, including a teacher check-in initiative with EWS students.
6. Quarterly review of students in EWS with ILT to determine other ways to impact student success if needed.

Person Responsible	Allison Wright (wright2a@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Growth Mindset is a Social Emotional Initiative the school began undertaking during the second semester of the 2019-2020 school year. Through Professional Development cycles and coaching, teachers will learn how to instructionally develop a growth mindset with students in the classroom, helping to improve their overall attitude and ability to learn and grow as successful individuals.

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.

At Parrish Community High School, a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved is created through Growth Mindset Professional Developments with teachers, opportunities on Instructional Leadership Teams and Intensive Support Teams, SAC Meetings, Booster Club Meetings, and an active Key Club at the school.
The Growth Mindset Professional Developments help to create a culture of learning and growth, with an emphasis on meeting students where they are to help them improve.
The SAC and Booster clubs meet regularly with all stakeholders - teachers, parents, community members, students, and administration - to help foster initiatives to better the school overall.
The ILT and IST encourage teacher feedback, teacher input, and parent input to support student growth.
The Key Club initiates community service activities to involve the school in the community and the community in the school.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**