

Clay County Schools

Robert M. Paterson Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Robert M. Paterson Elementary

5400 PINE AVE, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://pes.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: John O'brian

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	36%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Robert M. Paterson Elementary

5400 PINE AVE, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://pes.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-6	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

R.M. Paterson Elementary seeks to create a learning environment where faculty encourages high expectations and collaboratively works together to implement the Florida State Standards that will provide a quality education to all students. Our school promotes a safe, nurturing, and supportive environment that fosters high self esteem and encourages and motivates students to do their personal best. Furthermore, we strive to have parents, teachers, and community members to be actively involved in our student's learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For teachers to continue to improve their knowledge and perfect their teaching skills through resources, workshops, and training opportunities provided by the school and district. For teachers to enhance their understanding of the new curriculum while implementing these best teaching practices in the classroom, directly impacting students to better prepare them for their continuous academic growth, college and careers in the future.

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
O'Brian, John	Principal	Directing and overseeing the daily operations, safety and goals of the school.
Schumacher, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Support the Principal in the overseeing the daily operations of the school.
Stokes, Lori	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal in the everyday functions of the school. Various duties and responsibilities are parallel with the academic and social and emotional goals of the District.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, John O'brian

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.*

11

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

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	36%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	145	134	161	153	129	149	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	1021
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	7	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	1	1	2	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	7	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 10/2/2020

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	150	167	156	133	160	147	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	1066
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	7	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	150	167	156	133	160	147	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	1066
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	7	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	79%	65%	57%	79%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	62%	58%	70%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	54%	53%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	70%	63%	77%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	66%	62%	72%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	74%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	65%	53%	79%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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	78%	68%	10%	58%	20%
	2018	81%	68%	13%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	58%	21%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	79%	62%	17%	56%	23%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	74%	64%	10%	54%	20%
	2018	77%	63%	14%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	71%	8%	62%	17%
	2018	78%	70%	8%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	69%	12%	64%	17%
	2018	78%	66%	12%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	73%	64%	9%	60%	13%
	2018	73%	65%	8%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	78%	70%	8%	55%	23%
	2018	82%	68%	14%	52%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	63%	8%	53%	18%
	2018	71%	64%	7%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	51	61	54	48	57	50	36				
ELL	61	63	50	70	67	50					
ASN	100			100							
BLK	53	63	40	53	57	62	9				
HSP	66	63	52	67	61	40	65				
MUL	65	58		76	83						
WHT	85	73	71	86	84	68	82				
FRL	65	66	57	66	67	46	55				
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	50	56	52	51	54	42	38				
ELL	50	60		56	82	80					
ASN	100	82		100	100						
BLK	65	57	50	49	61	47	45				
HSP	61	64	48	67	68	52	47				
MUL	87	92		87	75						
WHT	80	69	60	84	77	60	76				
FRL	67	63	46	68	74	54	62				
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	48	56	50	56	46	59	52				
ASN	92			75							
BLK	58	56	45	65	76	60					
HSP	66	55	36	65	63	64	63				

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
MUL	73										
WHT	83	73	59	80	72	76	82				
FRL	65	59	49	63	63	63	75				

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	70
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	60
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	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	59
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	71
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	78
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	60
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.

Lowest Quartile Mathematics Gains were the lowest percentage of PES 2019 FSA data scores. One of the major factors was the lack of rigor in our previous mathematics curriculum. It did not provide the necessary rigor to enhance students higher order thinking and exposure to processing that relates to problem solving.

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

No components had a decline. All components showed an increase from the previous year.

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.

No components. We were above the state average in every component.

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

Growth in our ELA overall proficiency. Intense exposure to learning the new I-Ready and Achieve 3000 and professional development. Revamping of PLCs and focus on small group instruction to close learning gaps and push students to higher achievement levels.

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

That all students are not achieving at a proficiency level.

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

1. Introduction of Eureka Math.
2. LAFS for 2nd grade and the challenging curriculum.
3. Continuous growth in the overall proficiency levels for students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Implementation of a new math curriculum from K to 6th grade.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The curriculum is new to Paterson and is a more rigorous content based. The higher level curriculum promotes students' higher level thinking and ownership of their learning.

Measurable Outcome: If all the teachers implement differentiated, small group instruction through the integration of the Eureka Math Curriculum, THEN, PES should see learning gains increase to 66% in mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: I- Ready data, PLCs, small group data, formal and informal observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The new implementation of Eureka Math curriculum at PES.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduction of the Eureka math curriculum.
2. Professional Development with guest speakers modeling lessons.
3. District Training and Coaches' support.
- 4 PLCs (grade level content and vertical format)

Person Responsible: John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Lower Quartile Student Progress

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We want to implement strategies and small group instruction with fidelity that will promote the academic success by showing gains to students that fall in the lower thirty-three percent.

Measurable Outcome: If all the teachers implement differentiated, small group instruction through the integration of small group instruction, THEN, PES should see learning gains increase in our Lower Quartile students to 61%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: I- Ready data, PLCs, small group data, formal and informal observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of small group instruction, evaluation of progress and monitoring data, and effective strategies to enhance student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Integrating small group instructions within the classroom with fidelity.
2. Professional Development with guest speakers modeling lessons.
3. District Training and Coaches' support.
- 4 PLCs (grade level content and vertical format)

Person Responsible: Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We want to create an environment in which students are more successful in school and in their daily life.
Measurable Outcome:	Decreased in number of referrals, increase in attendance and academic performance based on attendance. By implementing a focus SEL curriculum, PES should see a decrease in referrals by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS teams, Attendance team, and Guidance have monthly meetings to evaluate data and identify students that are at risk. Increase in community based involvement programs to foster a connection with the school. The implementation of the "7 Mindset" across all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To enhance the Social/Emotional Learning of students at Paterson and foster their potential to understand and apply the knowledge , attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBIS, Attendance, Discipline, and Academic data meetings.
2. Character Trait Lunches
3. Professional Development
4. MTSS Behavior
5. 7 Mindsets curriculum
5. Small Group Counseling

Person Responsible Mandy Sad (mandy.sad@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Continuing school community relationships
Positive Behavior Intervention Systems
Creating continuous positive school environment
Social and Emotional Learning integration within our campus.

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.

PES has a well developed plan for communicating with all stakeholders. School, activities, etc., information is continuously provided to parents and community. PES has several activities throughout the school year that promotes school and community participation.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Implementation of a new math curriculum from K to 6th grade.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Lower Quartile Student Progress	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Social and Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00