

The School District of Lee County

# Lehigh Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Lehigh Elementary School

200 SCHOOLSIDE DR, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://lhl.leeschools.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Jackson Morgan**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (44%)<br>2016-17: C (46%)<br>2015-16: C (43%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* 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 Lee 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

# Lehigh Elementary School

200 SCHOOLSIDE DR, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://lhl.leeschools.net>

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p>                |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.**

Through teamwork, innovation, and the power of yet, Lehigh Elementary will provide a passionate pursuit of student excellence.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Lehigh Elementary is to empower all students to reach their highest potential academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally.

### 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   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Morgan, Jackson     | Principal           | <p>Oversee and monitoring progress of student achievement, PD, overview of teachers evaluations and walkthroughs, analyzing data for all components of SIP. Monthly meetings with grade levels to discuss data, SIP goals, class goals, and individual student goals.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| Stafford, Jessica   | Assistant Principal | <p>Oversee and monitoring progress of student achievement, PD, overview of teachers evaluations and walkthroughs, analyzing data for all components of SIP. Monthly meetings with grade levels to discuss data, SIP goals, class goals, and individual student goals.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| Sparrow, Janelle    | School Counselor    | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p>    |
| LaMotta, Ana        | Instructional Coach | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p>    |
| Amott, Christine    | Instructional Coach | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p>    |
| Martinez, Dayami    | Teacher, K-12       | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.</p> <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p>    |
| Trepasso, Katherine | School Counselor    | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.</p>  |



| Name                     | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---|
|                          |                     | <p>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p>   |
| Peterson, Monica         | Instructional Coach | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.<br/>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| Williams, Amanda         | Assistant Principal | <p>collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.<br/>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| Ledbetter-Smith, Natasha | Instructional Coach | <p>Collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.<br/>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| McStravic, Angela        | Instructional Coach | <p>Collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.<br/>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |
| Canino, Cara             | Instructional Coach | <p>Collaborate with SIP team to review data on student achievement, attendance, and behavior. Problem solve if a negative trend appears and work with admin on professional development that staff might need to be more successful and celebrate positive trends.<br/>The grade chair facilitates all PLC meeting and rolls out any leadership discussions for each month.</p> |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Jackson Morgan

**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.*

3

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

56

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (44%)<br>2016-17: C (46%)<br>2015-16: C (43%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**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               | 168         | 154 | 170 | 159 | 175 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 972 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 18          | 25  | 27  | 17  | 31  | 21  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 139 |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 4   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 1           | 10  | 1   | 39  | 21  | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 79  |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 4   | 1   | 10  | 6   | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 25  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 14  | 21  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 35  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 7   | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 33  |

**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 | 2           | 7 | 1 | 15 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 65 |

**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     | 3           | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 2  |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 10/24/2020

**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     | 162         | 188 | 173 | 177 | 156 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1063 |
| 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 8 10 0 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 35

**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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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 162 188 173 177 156 207 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1063

Attendance below 90 percent 0 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 0

Course failure in ELA or Math 0 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 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 8 10 0 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 35

**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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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            | 46%    | 57%      | 57%   | 45%    | 55%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 53%    | 56%      | 58%   | 48%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    | 50%      | 53%   | 47%    | 49%      | 52%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement            | 54%    | 62%      | 63%   | 50%    | 60%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 57%    | 65%      | 62%   | 54%    | 60%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43%    | 54%      | 51%   | 32%    | 50%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 46%    | 52%      | 53%   | 49%    | 51%      | 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 | 51%    | 58%      | -7%                        | 58%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 55%      | -11%                       | 57%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 45%    | 55%      | -10%                       | 58%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 53%      | -15%                       | 56%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 40%    | 54%      | -14%                       | 56%   | -16%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 52%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 60%    | 61%      | -1%                        | 62%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 58%      | -1%                        | 62%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 49%    | 62%      | -13%                       | 64%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 58%      | -14%                       | 62%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 48%    | 58%      | -10%                       | 60%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 57%      | -19%                       | 61%   | -23%                    |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 45%    | 50%      | -5%                        | 53%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 52%      | -5%                        | 55%   | -8%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 7        | 21     | 20          | 17        | 40      | 37           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 18       | 47     | 51          | 33        | 50      | 35           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 52     | 60          | 42        | 51      | 40           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 52     | 45          | 54        | 57      | 39           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 53     |             | 79        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 55     | 29          | 59        | 63      | 58           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 48     | 46          | 49        | 53      | 42           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 6        | 25     | 31          | 5         | 25      | 32           | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 24       | 49     | 39          | 27        | 32      | 31           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 45     | 37          | 42        | 40      | 32           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 46     | 42          | 46        | 40      | 29           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 67     |             | 53        | 33      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 54     | 69          | 57        | 43      | 43           | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 46     | 46          | 45        | 39      | 32           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 10       | 21     | 22          | 18        | 24      | 20           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 15       | 36     | 42          | 24        | 44      | 33           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 45       | 49     | 50          | 44        | 45      | 31           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 50     | 48          | 47        | 57      | 39           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 63       |        |             | 67        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 51       | 41     | 37          | 58        | 54      | 16           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 41     | 44          | 46        | 52      | 33           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 52   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 413  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 27   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 41   |
| 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  | 51  |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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   | 53  |
| 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                                | 48  |
| 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.**

Math L25 was the lowest component showing 43%. However we increased the proficiency of the Math L25 from 33 to 43%, a 10% increase. We structured a breakfast club meeting every morning to meet with the L25 on standards which needed remedial work. Also, L25 students were invited to a



2-day extended day remediation on specific skills for 25 days prior to the FSA assessment. On-going standard-based instruction and data analysis took place weekly during PLC meetings. The leading contributing factor to this low performance would be student attendance. Lehigh Elementary had 20% of students chronically absent with some reaching more than 40 days absent. Our students with disability population is our gap sub-category (under 41%) and is addressed by educating staff on procedures when a student is absent and following up with both the families, school social worker if needed, and by having parent conferences. We are rewarding and celebrating students who have been prompt and present each month with no early sign outs. Each month students receive a certificate and a "pop" treat with admin celebrating with them in their classroom. Staff are also recognized for being prompt and present.

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

Science is the lowest performance with the proficiency dropping from 49% to 46%. Students Science proficiency rate continues to decline over the last three years. Due to student attendance and not being present in class, those that were chronically absent scored significantly lower.

**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.**

Based on District average: ELA 55-46 (-9), ELA LG 56-53 (-3), ELA L25 50-47 (-3), Math 62-54 (-8), Math LG 65-57 (-8), Math L25 54-43 (-11) and Science 50-46 (-4). Based on this data the largest gap in Math L25. Overall Math is trending lower at Lehigh for all three components in Math. It will continue to be a main focus for us.

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

Math Learning Gains had the most improvement in this area from 41 to 57%. Multiple actions were put into place: Math (PCT)Coaches supported grades 3-5th with standard-based instruction, on-going planning and analyzing math instruction after school with coaches, L25 and bubble students were invited to an extended day program 2 times a week starting in November, Extended Day Teachers were given material and PD for each week, all 4th and 5th grade teachers implemented a Math Breakfast Club to cover and review standards that needed remediation, and implementation of iReady Math in all classrooms for independent review.

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

EWS two potential concerns are the number of students failing in Math and ELA for grades 3rd & 4th for 2019, and the number of level 1's on FSA in 3rd & 4th on the 2019 assessment.

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

1. Math L25
2. ELA L25
3. Science Proficiency
4. ELA Proficiency
5. ELA

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Science Proficiency is identified as an area of focus for Lehigh Elementary based on FSA reports. In 2018, 49% of Lehigh students showed proficiency and in 2019, 46% of students showed proficiency. For the past two years, Lehigh Elementary is 5-8% lower than both state and district proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020, 52% of grade five Lehigh Elementary students will show proficiency on FSSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategy teachers will use at Lehigh Elementary to achieve the measurable outcome is a focus on the nature of science and inquiry in the daily science block, to include the use of experiments and writing. Additionally teachers will receive support and ongoing professional development from the science coach and PCT.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** All fourth and fifth grade classes have a daily, 60-minute science block. Within the science block, all classes will include science inquiry, investigations, and experiments that connect to the nature of science standards. Each quarter will include two, science fair related, experiments along with questioning and assessments. Inspire and online supplemental videos will be used to support student learning. Progress monitoring will take place through classroom walk throughs, monthly data chats with the admin team and academic coaches, and analysis of student achievement data. 5th grade teachers will review 3rd and 4th grade standards with students, with support from the science coach and ongoing professional development.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers watch and conduct science experiments to prepare instruction
2. Teachers use science reasoning and advanced questioning in daily science block
3. Students complete science experiments
4. Students complete science experiment assessments
5. Teacher reflects with students in small group setting
6. Invite identified students to tutoring program as needed
7. Coaches will work with grade level teams to plan instruction
8. Students are encouraged to independently read interdisciplinary books to support curricular understanding

**Person Responsible** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Math Lowest 25 Percentile is identified as an area of focus for Lehigh Elementary based on FSA reports. In 2018, 33% of Lehigh students made gains and in 2019, 43% of students made gains. For the past two years, this is the lowest school grade category for Lehigh Elementary.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020, 49% of Lehigh Elementary students, identified in the lowest 25 percentile in math, will make a learning gain on the FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers at Lehigh Elementary School will use several strategies to achieve the measurable outcome. They will implement daily math reasoning, the use of mathematical discourse, engage in writing, and teach using the think-share-compare model. Additionally teachers will receive support and ongoing professional development from math coach and PCT. Progress monitoring will occur through the use of classroom walkthroughs, PLC's, and grade-level data chats.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Lehigh Elementary teachers participated in summer training focused on number sense and math reasoning, along with strategies and resources to use in their daily math block. Number sense strategies allow students to prove their math thinking as teachers focus on instructing math content with the standard and strategy in mind. Additionally, students will engage in discourse to help develop a stronger understanding of mathematical concepts. Students will write about their math understanding. The use of the think, share, compare model will help teachers facilitate the development of mathematical understanding.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify students as math lowest 25 percentile
2. Collaborative planning in grade level PLC and specific interventions for identified students
3. Implement math strategies in collaborative student groups to bridge gap and instruct on level
4. Utilize iReady online program and teacher-led plans in small group
5. Invite identified students to tutoring program as needed
6. Coaches will work with grade level teams to plan instruction
7. Students are encouraged to independently read interdisciplinary books to support curricular understanding

**Person Responsible** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ELA Lowest 25 Percentile is identified as an area of focus for Lehigh Elementary based on FSA reports. In 2018, 43% of Lehigh students made gains and in 2019, 47% of students made gains. Components of ELA are found in every subject and increasing support is crucial for future success.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020, 49% of Lehigh Elementary students, identified in the lowest 25 percentile in ELA, will make a learning gain on the FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Lehigh Elementary will use iReady program and resources to increase growth of students identified as ELA lowest 25 percentile. Students will receive targeted instruction using the data from i-Ready. Students will also receive targeted instruction using the Sadlier Connect Vocabulary Workshop program and Really Great Reading phonics programs. Additionally teachers will receive support and ongoing professional development from the literacy coach and PCT. Progress monitoring will occur through the use of classroom walkthroughs, PLC's, and grade level data chats.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** i-Ready program offers digital learning paths based on highest area of need along with small group teacher plans to effectively meet students at their learning level. Instructional grouping are created based on diagnostics throughout the school year. iReady offers teachers a variety of engagement tools for whole and small group instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify students in ELA lowest 25 percentile
2. Administer diagnostic and compare data to previous year
3. Strive for forty-five minutes of digital learning program
4. Small group, differentiated teacher instruction
5. Track and compare data based on reporting category and student need
6. Invite identified students to tutoring as needed.
7. Coaches will work with grade level teams to plan instruction
8. Students are encouraged to independently read interdisciplinary books to support curricular understanding

**Person Responsible** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Lehigh Elementary identified out of school suspension as an area of need due to decreased instructional time leading to student stagnancy. When students are not in school, there are missed opportunities for instruction, leveled academic support, social-emotional support, and modeled expectations.

**Measurable Outcome:** Lehigh Elementary will decrease out of school suspension from 23 to 21 by the end of the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Lehigh Elementary will implement restorative practices through PBIS. Staff and students will identify, model, and explain PAWS, Lehigh Elementary's acronym for specific PBIS expectations for all stakeholders. The PBIS team meets with staff and students monthly to lead and support implementation. Along with PBIS, the Mental Health team meets weekly in identifying student needs and strategies of support. The Mental Health team includes both school counselors, administration, school nurse, behavioral specialist, and the social worker. In order to best support students with disabilities we will provide training on restorative practices and Kagan cooperative learning structures for all teachers. Our dean of students and behavior specialist will work alongside the special education teachers to provide preventative strategies to our students with frequent behaviors. They will also provide supports within the classroom for students with behavioral needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Lehigh Elementary implemented PBIS expectations for a common language throughout campus. PAWS is used daily in all areas and grade levels, and models appropriate actions for all stakeholders. Collaborative efforts through professional development and strategy-based supports focuses on student needs and improvement. Providing preventative strategies and restorative practices for all teachers supports the needs of our students with disabilities.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PBIS team complete a professional development with all staff members.
2. Teachers and staff introduce PAWS to students with modeled expectations.
3. Teachers as students to identify appropriate PAWS around campus.
4. Mental Health Team meets weekly to identify student needs.
5. PBIS analyze implementation steps and support stakeholders
6. Dean of students and behavior specialist will provide preventative strategies, restorative practices, and Kagan cooperative structures
7. Special education teachers will provide in-class support for behavioral needs

**Person Responsible:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Student Absenteeism is identified as an area of focus for Lehigh Elementary based on student needs. If students are absent, their academic, social and emotional needs may not be met.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020, Lehigh Elementary will decrease the number of students with absence rate of greater than 10% from 245 to 220 by the end of the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Lehigh Elementary administration will promote strong communication between family and school. Administration will send home postcards to inform families of their teacher and welcome them to the school year. Teachers will be expected to reach out to the families within the first two weeks of school to introduce themselves and discuss the importance of attendance in school. Information specialist, teachers, and administrations will monitor attendance data. Teachers will reach out to families with any specific concerns regarding attendance. Teachers will report chronic absenteeism to administration and social worker. Social worker will provide strategies to families to promote better attendance. In situations where absenteeism continues the social worker will create a plan with the family. School will also provide communication regarding attendance in the monthly newsletter.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Using data to track attendance will identify trends in the school, grade, and classes. Tracking attendance data also allows responsive actions with Lehigh Elementary social worker. Studies show that initial communication reduces the number of students with absenteeism by 10%. Research shows that strong communication between the family and school promotes increased attendance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Admin will send out postcards to families at the start of the year
2. Teachers will communicate with parents within the first week of school to discuss goals and attendance
3. Teachers will discuss importance of attendance in class
4. Administration will explain attendance goals on school-broadcast news
5. Social Worker will communicate in monthly newsletter about attendance matters
6. School will post in social media the importance of attending school
7. Parents will be updated on attendance via the school marquee
8. Special education teachers will work alongside social worker to communicate with families regarding student attendance for our students with disabilities

**Person Responsible:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)



**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data from the 2018 ESSA results indicates that 25% of students with disabilities made learning gains in ELA. In 2019, there were 21% of students with disabilities making learning gains in ELA. The trend indicates a decrease in numbers and

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020, Lehigh Elementary will increase the number of students with disabilities making learning gains in ELA from 21% to 26% by the end of the school year, as measured by ESSA data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Unique Learning Curriculum and iReady will be used as the evidence-based strategies to increase ELA learning gains. The i-Ready program offers digital learning paths based on highest area of need in addition to with small group teacher instruction to effectively meet students at their learning level. Instructional groupings are created based on diagnostics throughout the school year. i-Ready offers teachers a variety of engagement tools for whole and small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** i-Ready is an evidence-based program that assists students with filling learning gaps while providing them with targeted instruction to meet their needs. The online and small group instruction allows students the opportunity to receive differentiated instruction. Teachers have access to multiple lessons based on student domains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Admin will meet with special education teachers monthly to review needs and data
2. Special education teachers work with small groups of students targeting IEP goals
3. Paraprofessionals work with small groups of students providing support on grade level standards
4. Coaches will work with special education team to plan instruction
5. Students are encouraged to independently read interdisciplinary books to support curricular understanding

**Person Responsible** Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school leadership team will address the L25 groups in Math by providing support from the math coach and instructional coaches in a collaborative setting with grade level teams. Coaches will work with teachers to analyze math data and plan for targeted instruction using a data analysis protocol. The leadership team will meet weekly to review school, grade level, and class data to track math progress for the L25 math students. The math coach strategically works with teachers and students as needed.**

**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.

Lehigh Elementary builds positive relationships with parents, families, and the community through a variety of methods: SAC Meetings, Spirit Nights at local businesses such as Three Peppers, McDonalds, Culvers, and Suncoast Schools Federal Credit Union. We utilize the Watch DOGS program to invite and encourage positive male role models to volunteer in our school. We have partnered up with the Piper Center to have their population volunteer to work with students under staff supervision. Lehigh hosts a yearly volunteer breakfast to inform families on areas we need volunteers and to assist them with signing up and completing the volunteer application. All of our communication is always produced in both English and Spanish. Lehigh will be opening a student run branch of Suncoast Schools Federal Credit Union in October where both students and families can learn about financial literacy, open their own account, and make monthly deposits. The Lehigh admin team has been active participants in the local Lehigh Rotary and Lehigh Chamber of Commerce by attending monthly meetings. Some of the feedback the school received from families during SAC Meetings, is that they appreciate personal, specific communication. Ms. Wipf personally sends out postcards to all new students that are enrolled to Lehigh Elementary, to officially welcome them to our school family. Administration further led a positive communication initiative by providing schoolwide professional development for all teachers on how to build relationships with families, then holding them accountable within the first two weeks of school to reach out and make a personal positive connection with the families of all their students. Open discussions during SAC Meetings which includes: parents, teachers, students, community members, and business partners, and are held monthly are an excellent way to receive communication from families.

**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: Science           | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math              | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA               | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline         | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |



|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
|  | <b>Total:</b> <b>\$0.00</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|