

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Brandon Success Center



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	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Brandon Success Center

1019 N PARSONS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jeanne Terry Byrd

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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 Hillsborough 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Brandon Success Center

1019 N PARSONS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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)
High School 6-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Brandon EPIC-3 will provide a safe, structured learning environment that promotes the academic and social changes that allow students to achieve their highest level of success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Brandon EPIC-3 will be the model for non-traditional alternative education programs nationwide.

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
Bobo, Cornelius	Principal	Supervise and facilitate the daily operations of the school. Creating Educational Objectives. One of the primary duties of a school principal is to oversee School Finances. School principals are largely responsible for overseeing their schools'... Train and Evaluate Staff. School principals must work closely with teachers to ensure... Interaction With Students and Parents.
Bramlett, Glenn	Assistant Principal	Performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, public relations.
Vickers, Becky		
Martin, Miranda	Assistant Principal	Performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, public relations.
Brooks, Kevin	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/24/2017, Jeanne Terry Byrd

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

4

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	3	7	12	5	9	2	38	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4	7	0	27	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	0	10	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	2	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	2	13	

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	1	0	1

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	35	22	19	1	113
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	5	2	2	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	19	14	11	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	22	8	6	0	51

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	2	9	18	32	18	18	1	98

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	1	4	11	8	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	2	0	9

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	2	10	24	35	22	19	1	113
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	5	2	2	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	19	14	11	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	22	8	6	0	51

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	2	9	18	32	18	18	1	98

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	1	4	11	8	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	2	0	9

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%	56%	56%	0%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	49%	51%	0%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	48%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	45%	0%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	69%	68%	0%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	73%	0%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	15%	53%	-38%	54%	-39%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	6%	54%	-48%	52%	-46%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	4%	53%	-49%	56%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	8%	61%	-53%	54%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
	2018	4%	29%	-25%	45%	-41%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	4%	47%	-43%	48%	-44%
	2018	4%	48%	-44%	50%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	66%	-41%	67%	-42%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		25%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	5%	67%	-62%	71%	-66%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	71%	-71%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		30%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

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.

Middle School Math data - we had a -38% discrepancy in the district average and a 55% gap in the State Comparison Data. Students struggle in courses due to a lack of

consistent standards-based planning and student-centered instruction.

Test grades and data component are not on the state or district average and we continuously mediate based on the students current progression plan and there individualize needs. Bio EOC was at 25% a -41 % deficient from the district. US History is a -73% deficient, and Algebra EOC is -33%.

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

8th grade ELA - in grade level data showed the greatest decline of a -6% decline from the year before. Contributing factors that impacted students were a lack of access to project-based instruction. Students struggle in courses due to a lack of consistent standards-based planning and student-centered instruction

EOC Data - Theses students are on a computer based program, and not in face to face instruction

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.

ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The students were well below the state average on learning gains, so the trend is showing that we are going to close the gap through increased reading comprehension.

ESE vacancies causing impact across contents and grade levels. The lack of Instructional Coaches made it difficult to provide the level of support necessary for new teachers and building the capacity of all teachers.

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

Middle School math had the greatest increase from year to year as there was an 6% increase in the 8th grade math levels. The actions taken was an increase of tutoring services offered across all grade levels by the math teacher.

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

Retention's and Students with 2 or more indicators is an area of focus. Our Student Services Team and MTSS Coaches will be working with these students directly and coordinating tiered levels of support/intervention to address needs.

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

1. Increase the percentage of students meeting proficiency as demonstrated on the FSA/ELA.
2. Increase the percentage of students attending school at least 80 % of the time.
3. Decrease the percentage of students receiving a referral resulting in in-school or out of school suspension.
4. Increase the percentage of students meeting proficiency as demonstrated on the US History EOC.
5. Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency as demonstrated on the Biology EOC..

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Improve Student Literacy through the use of strategically planned lessons that aligned with the Florida state standards and a balanced curriculum.</p> <p>Increase the Reading Level of students which will translate into better understanding and increased comprehension.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Improve student performance in reading based on data from School City, FSA scores, baseline writing assessments scores to the proficiency level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>1. Teachers who are involved in coaching cycles, including modeling, and give focused feedback (written and/or face-to-face) from assigned admin at least weekly.</p> <p>Other team member at least twice per month in order to provide individual feedback about progress and continued need assessments.</p> <p>2. focused walk-throughs conducted by admin team in order to provide school-wide feedback about progress in the classroom.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates Teachers are able to retain and apply new learning and skills when support and PD is provided in the classroom/school setting with colleagues.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development regarding Standards and Aligning Task Complexity to Standards
2. Lesson Modeling / Demonstration Classrooms
3. Increase student engagement and hands-on opportunities as well as exposure to supplemental materials and resources.

Person Responsible Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Creating a Positive School Culture and Climate (Student and Faculty)

**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

ASQI Survey Results, Discipline Data, and Teacher Retention rates all suggest that School Culture and Climate suffered last year. Stakeholder Perception (including Teachers, Students, and Community) can negatively impact participation in school function and performance. Student time spent out of classroom as a result of disciplinary incidents impeded academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2019-2020 ASQI Survey, results in all components of the following domains will increase at least 10% or higher for the upcoming year:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Brandon EPIC will implement systems of supports for Teachers, Students, and Families/Community Stakeholders including on-boarding for new staff, PBIS, on-going reinforcement of systems/ expectations for all, increased involvement opportunities for all stakeholders and encouraging teacher leadership.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When all stakeholders feel valued and included in school happenings and decision-making, overall culture and climate will improve. Teacher retention will improve through the on-boarding supports that will be provided to new teachers. Students will be explicitly taught expectations, and these expectations will be reinforced consistently via incentives and SEL. Providing Social Emotional Learning opportunities for students regularly will provide them with the tools to successfully manage emotions and allow for positive social experiences. Shared decision-making among Faculty will increase buy in and participation in school initiatives and function.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide implementation of PBIS with fidelity (Point Sheets).
2. New Teacher On-Boarding Process throughout year tailored to their needs.
3. Grade Level assemblies at the start of each Semester to reinforce expectations.
4. Implementation of Social Emotional Learning
5. Shared Decision-making, when appropriate, via Committees, Leadership Team, PLC's.
6. Increased opportunity for Family and Community involvement via building partnerships within the community, School Advisory Committee, more frequent communication with Families, etc. Parent liaison will assist and manage Parent Room resources.
7. MTSS/Data Team will coordinate Tier 2 and 3 interventions

Person Responsible

Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Behavior Student placement to this campus is centered around negative behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	10 percent reduction in suspensions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS, Interventions surrounding our Ed Connect Behavior Tracker, Student Enrichment Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on previous data from the prior years, these strategies have shown marked improvement over previous reporting periods.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AP and student support staff created interventions based on behavior tracker data
2. Student Enrichment Team discussions based on success of behavior tracker data
3. Restorative Practices Circles within classrooms
4. Student PBIS point sheets
5. Increased collaboration between classroom teachers and lab managers

Person Responsible Cornelius Bobo (cornelius.bobo@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. **Building Teacher Capacity: Cross-Curricular Literacy, Standards-Based Planning & Standard Complexity**
2. **School Culture and Climate (Student and Faculty)**

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.

Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drives individuals, at any level and in any profession. In the school setting, it is critically important that we celebrate and recognize the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and out of our buildings. Below is a list of attributes we will use

at Brandon EPIC Center

1. Invest in People, Build Relationships
2. Have a Shared Vision.
3. Be a Role Model, Set the Tone.
4. Praise and Celebrate

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00