Palm River Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm River Elementary School

805 MAYDELL DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Mccluney   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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

Palm River Elementary School

805 MAYDELL DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

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

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.

Palm River Elementary students will achieve academic excellence in an environment where personalized instruction is the priority.

Provide the school's vision statement.

PAWS

Positive Attitude
Act Respectfully
Work Hard
Stay Safe

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
McCluney, Kelly	Principal	Develops and monitors all SIP areas to improve student achievement outcomes. Consults with various stakeholders to share progress towards SIP goals and modify the plan as needed throughout the school year.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kelly Mccluney

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.*
2

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	58	61	63	65	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	17	19	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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

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	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	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	

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	41%	52%	57%	31%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	45%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	45%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	54%	63%	31%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	62%	37%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	51%	49%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	23%	48%	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	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%	
	2018	35%	53%	-18%	57%	-22%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%	
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	56%	-24%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%	
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%	
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	62%	-27%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	38%	57%	-19%	64%	-26%	
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	62%	-32%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%	
	2018	26%	54%	-28%	61%	-35%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison		9%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	53%	-14%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	27	51	58	28	54	67	32				
ELL	40	50	45	45	61		42				
BLK	36	47	60	37	48	43	44				
HSP	46	58	56	48	58		41				
WHT	36	63		44	44						
FRL	42	55	56	43	54	45	43				
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	20	45	33	26	38	46	35				
ELL	27	29	14	31	43	67	19				
BLK	24	38	47	30	36	26	22				
HSP	37	43	11	36	49	56	38				
MUL	10										
WHT	46	47		38	29		40				
FRL	31	41	29	32	39	40	30				
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	11	26	39	13	30	54	6				
ELL	21	35		34	38	40	12				
BLK	26	46	45	22	32	50	19				
HSP	35	38		40	36	30	29				
WHT	36	63		35	52						
FRL	32	44	46	32	37	49	24				

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	50

ESSA Federal Index	
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	50
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	47
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	50
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 lowest data component from the 2018-2019 school year are students with disabilities with 27% proficiency in ELA and 20% proficiency in mathematics. A contributing factor was the lack of rapid interventions for targeted groups of students who have significant learning gaps or who lack key foundational skills. This particular subgroup of students did show growth in overall gains and in the lowest 25% gains.

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

Our subgroup of white students showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. They declined 46% to 36% proficiency in 2019. A contributing factor was the lack of rapid interventions for this targeted group of students who have significant learning gaps or who lack key foundational skills.

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 data component with biggest gap from the 2018-2019 school year was 4th grade ELA achievement which was 26% below state average. A contributing factor was the lack of rapid interventions for targeted groups of students who have significant learning gaps or who lack key foundational skills. Misalignment of instructional task to grade level standards and improper assessment of student learning towards the intended learning target.

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 from the 2018-2019 school year was our ELA Lowest 25% gains which improved 26 percentage points from the previous year. Our school focused on ELA collaborative planning sessions with coaches and a systemic approach to progress monitoring interventions for targeted groups of students with significant learning gaps and/or those who lacked key foundational skills.

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

According to our EWS data indicates, that an area of concern are our students with an attendance rate below 90%. During the 2019 school year, we had 89 students who had an attendance rate lower than 90%.

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

1. SWD Students
2. Black Students
3. White Students
4. ELL Students
5. Free & Reduced Lunch

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	31% of Kindergarten-5th grade teachers were rated progressing in the component of 3d-Using Assessment in Instruction. As a result, less than 25% of students in grades Kindergarten- 5th scored at the Mid Grade Level status on the i-Ready Fall Diagnostic . This indicates that the majority of our students are only meeting the bare minimum requirements to be considered proficient for their grade standards. Essential practices such as progress monitoring throughout core instruction, offering feedback to students that address misconceptions and making adjustments throughout the lesson twill be implemented to ensure students are progressing towards mastery of the intended learning target resulting in student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	By October 2020, 50% of Kindergarten-5th grade teachers will use evidence of effective assessment practices as indicated in actionable look-fors through daily classroom observations by administration. 100% of students in grades Kindergarten-5th will show a years growth by reaching and/or exceeding their iReady typical growth measure from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities Professional Development Student Goal Setting
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student Goal-Setting is a foundational strategy that supports short- and long-term learning goals across all instructional practices. Students will create specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound goals to reach an identified learning outcomes. Students will turn learning targets into actionable learning goals. Analyze their own work to identify misconceptions and errors in order to make progress in their learning goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher teams will analyze data weekly to identify root causes of why students are not meeting proficiency on instructional task ; on the basis of this analysis, students will be grouped according to the student work protocol and provided targeted interventions. Curricular scope and sequence will be revisited in response to data.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Targeted interventions will be provided for tier 2 students who do not demonstrate proficiency with instructional tasks during core instruction. Tier 3 students will be provided with intensive support and targeted inventions to address lack of key foundational skills to reduce significant learning gaps.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Academic coaches will collaborate with teachers to define and implement expectations for feedback that is specific and helps students understand and correct their mistakes and misconceptions regarding specific criteria for success.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All staff will participate in quarterly school wide professional development to learn and practice high-leverage
brain-based instructional strategies.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Students track their own goals and progress data, know their current level of proficiency, and receive frequent feedback on their performance and areas of improvement.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Grade-level and content teams will review student work samples during grade level professional communities to analyze student progress towards mastery of each standard and what actions students need to demonstrate in order to achieve proficiency.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2019-2020 school year, 95 discipline referrals were entered into the online discipline referral system. This indicates an increase of 26 referrals from the 2018-2019 school year. Due to the increase in behavior referrals, students are losing significant amounts of instructional time.
Measurable Outcome:	Behavior referrals will be reduced by 50% by implementing a Positive Behavior Intervention Support system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Intervention Support- PBIS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a philosophy for helping individuals whose problem behaviors are barriers to reaching their goals. It is based on the well-researched science of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA). PBS interventions are designed both to reduce problem behaviors and increase adaptive, socially appropriate behaviors. These outcomes are achieved through teaching new skills and changing environments that might trigger problem behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement multiple formal structures through which school values and expected behaviors are taught and reinforced; daily rewards and consequences are published and shared widely.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Student social-emotional and social responsibility skills are included and explicitly named in the expectations of behavior.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Staff members have a written profile for every one of their students that includes the student's strength and
growth areas.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Create an accountability system so that all infractions are addressed in a consistent manner, and hold staff
responsible for consistently implementing rewards and consequences with all students, not only those they directly teach.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

NA

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00