

Clay County Schools

Argyle Elementary School



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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Dimitra Mainer

Start Date for this Principal: 9/29/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

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	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

The mission of Argyle Elementary School is to equip students with the skills needed to forge the future's next discoveries, inventions, solutions and adventures in a world of new possibilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County and Argyle Elementary School exist to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Ward, Angela	Principal	The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is comprised of a teacher from each grade level, including ESE and administrators. Each team member is responsible for helping to make data-based decisions using student data and grade appropriate benchmarks and expectations. The SBLT member shares information pertaining to the Multi Tiered Support System with their grade level teams and helps guide their grade level's data conversations during team meetings.
Ayers, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Sutton, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	
Runte, Terry	Teacher, K-12	
Ledbetter, Jane	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Tara	Teacher, ESE	
Francis, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Traci	Teacher, K-12	
Corbitt, Mary Jo	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Easter	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/29/2020, Dimitra Mainer

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	89	76	94	106	92	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	8	12	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	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	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 10/4/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	

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	74	74	98	97	97	104	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	

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	65%	65%	57%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	62%	58%	62%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	53%	49%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	70%	63%	73%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	66%	62%	66%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	56%	51%	58%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	53%	58%	55%	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	69%	68%	1%	58%	11%
	2018	62%	68%	-6%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	58%	3%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	64%	62%	2%	56%	8%
	2018	53%	59%	-6%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	71%	1%	62%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	70%	7%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
	2018	60%	66%	-6%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	76%	64%	12%	60%	16%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	63%	3%	53%	13%
	2018	58%	64%	-6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	46	59	55	55	67	63	53				
ELL	56	54		67	93						
ASN	71	73		86	91						
BLK	52	63	67	67	66	69	60				
HSP	68	75	73	73	74	62	75				
MUL	79	87		67	64						
WHT	69	58	38	76	66	39	67				
FRL	59	65	67	68	68	57	65				
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	39	46	54	47	49	36	39				
ELL	79	80		79	80						
ASN	89	82		94	65						
BLK	52	61	48	71	73	58	37				
HSP	70	50		70	60	27	86				
MUL	68	59		73	63		82				
WHT	63	59	57	76	67	56	60				

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
FRL	59	61	54	73	71	57	57				
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	46	49	38	52	52	29	36				
ELL	50			70							
ASN	56	75		89	92						
BLK	55	57	44	61	59	52	32				
HSP	85	77		72	73		70				
MUL	68	70		71	75		60				
WHT	67	60	45	81	65	65	78				
FRL	56	55	43	67	66	58	43				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
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	80
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	63
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	71
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	74
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	59
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	64
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 data components that showed the lowest performance are Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in math and reading. A contributing factor includes curriculum utilized for content areas did not incorporate rigor and high expectations for academic ownership learning opportunities.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is math proficiency. The math proficiency score dropped from 74% to 72%. A contributing factor to this decline is the inconsistent use of math curriculum.

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 FSA ELA Lowest 25th Percentile is the area with the greatest gap when compared to the state average. A factor that contributed to this gap is the lack of solid Tier 3 interventions for students in the upper grades.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is science. The overall proficiency in science increased from 59% to 67% for the 2018-2019 school year. Argyle Elementary increased collaboration between teachers, instructional coaches, and administration. As a result, students completed learning opportunities in the classroom and in the science labs that were more rigorous than in the previous year.

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

Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA ELA
Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA Math

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

1. Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA ELA
2. Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA Math
3. Increase Proficiency on FSA ELA Assessments
4. Promote Student Attendance (Increase daily attendance rates)
5. Promote a Positive and Safe Learning Environment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: If we increase teachers' knowledge of high yield instructional strategies through targeted and intentional coaching, teachers' expectations will increase and student outcomes will improve.

Measurable Outcome: 70% of students' i-Ready Reading scores will improve from the first diagnostic to third diagnostic by an average of 10 points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Ward (angela.ward@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increased teacher knowledge as it relates to students' demonstration of understanding

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through questions, tasks, interactions or assessments, students demonstrate how well students understand lesson content. Data is used to allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and allow for lesson adjustments.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaching cycles

Person Responsible Angela Ward (angela.ward@myoneclay.net)

Supported planning/PLC

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Modeled instruction

Person Responsible Angela Ward (angela.ward@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus	If all stakeholders continually model and reinforce the PBIS plan and acknowledge and celebrate students progress regularly, then a culture will develop that promotes high expectations and , both behavioral and academic for all students.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a reduction in the number of discipline referrals by 10% at the end of the school year. Students will be more successful on their MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans. SEL is an important part of a well rounded education. Classroom observations will include SEL noticing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ward (angela.ward@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intentional instruction with high expectations and rigorous tasks with the teacher being a warm demander to attend to the needs of students' socio-emotional well-being while intentionally instruction to increase the academic growth of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are provided consistent opportunities to engage in grade-level appropriate tasks while providing access to high quality instruction through teachers' attitudes and beliefs in the ability of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish and communicate PBIS goals and progress to all stakeholders

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide professional learning around high expectations and rigorous tasks

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide SEL support through 7 Mindsets activities

Person Responsible Angela Ward (angela.ward@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA ELA
2. Increase Lowest Quartile Gains in FSA Math
3. Increase Proficiency on FSA ELA Assessments
4. Promote Student Attendance (Increase daily attendance rates)
5. Promote a Positive and Safe Learning Environment

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.

Argyle Elementary will continue Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports processes centered around Argyle P.R.I.D.E. (P= positive attitude, R= respect, I= integrity, D= diligence, and E= excellence). Argyle is excited to begin the 7 Mindsets this year which is designed to promote self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making in students. Students have access to our guidance counselor, Military Family Life Counselor, and social worker. Teachers and staff are trained in SEL to support Argyle students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00