

Jackson County School Board

Sneads Elementary School



2021-22 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Sneads Elementary School

1961 LOCKEY DR, Sneads, FL 32460

<http://ses.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Zane Walden

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-4
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/19/2021.

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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Sneads Elementary School

1961 LOCKEY DR, Sneads, FL 32460

<http://ses.jcsb.org>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-4	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	24%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/19/2021.

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.

Our Beliefs:

We believe that every student is important and can learn.

We believe that learning to read is the cornerstone for all education.

We believe that family and community involvement benefits student achievement.

We believe that continuous improvement is essential to the growth and development of both student and staff members.

We believe that a safe and secure environment is essential for teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AN EDUCATION IS LIFE'S BEST TREASURE

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Howell, Melynda	Principal	Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regular meetings for SLT, makes decisions on how Tier 2 and Tier 3 services will be delivered.
McIntosh, Amber	Assistant Principal	Serves as a team leader, directs team activities, monitors data for RTI, communicates with staff about SLT findings, assists in making decisions about services to students.
Downum, Jeannie	Teacher, K-12	Assists in the implementation of SLT, School Improvement Chair, SAC Lead, Supports RTI implementation
Perkins, Brandi	Other	RTI Specialist. Supports SLT implementation. Supports interventions to students. Assists in resources for students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Zane Walden

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

532

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	124	104	98	80	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	40	33	23	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	8	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	4	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	26	26	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	6	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/5/2021

2020-21 - 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	104	120	96	99	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	3	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	18	14	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	4	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

2020-21 - 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	104	120	96	99	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	3	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	1	4	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	18	14	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	
Students retained two or more times	0	4	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				75%	63%	57%	77%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	58%	58%	70%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	49%	53%	63%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				88%	66%	63%	91%	70%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	58%	62%	77%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	45%	51%	68%	40%	47%
Science Achievement					54%	53%	74%	56%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	62%	17%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	89%	70%	19%	62%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	90%	71%	19%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	72			81							
BLK	63			58							
WHT	77			89							
FRL	67			78							
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	49	41		76	56						
BLK	50	47		67	56						
HSP	82			100							
MUL	75			83							
WHT	80	69	82	93	79	83					
FRL	74	67	67	87	74	73					

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	62	57	42	72	60	36	56				
BLK	59	62	50	74	69	60	47				
HSP	70			100							
WHT	81	74	68	94	77	70	83				
FRL	69	69	63	86	76	63	61				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	157
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	77
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	83
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trend that has emerged over the past years is students with disabilities scoring in the lowest 25th% of ELA are not making the learning gains expected. Learning gains dropped 16 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data from the 2019 state assessments, our learning gains for students with disabilities were 41% which is down from 57% and show the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Our area of the state was hit by a category 5 hurricane in October 2018, and our students missed several instructional days. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we had to provide instruction virtually in March 2020. Last year was also interrupted with numerous days of quarantine for several students and distant learning, which may have also created lack of instruction. We have worked hard to provide differentiated instruction for all students to help fill the gaps due to this lack of instruction. Other new actions would include purposely targeting SWD for learning gains in ELA by small group instruction focusing on individual academic needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

From 2018 to 2019, both our ELA lowest 25th percentile and Math lowest 25th percentile increased by 8%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We provided differentiated instruction by specifically looking at the strengths and weaknesses of our students. We had a walk to read program where we were able to really focus on individual student needs. We implemented data days once a month to really look at the needs of our students. We created a data wall so that we could constantly reflect on the increases and decreases with our students in areas such as iReady.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will need to continue implementing whole group, as well as small group instruction with fidelity and targeting areas for improvement for each student. We will continue our walk to read program and differentiated instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue our monthly data days, as well as school wide data days during our inservice days. We have had training with Stephanie King, district literacy coach, in forming our School Literacy Team. The team will focus on needs for improving ELA school wide. In addition, we've had training

with Reva Reynolds, District MTSS Specialist, on differentiating instruction for students to target learning gains.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A continued focus on differentiating instruction for all students based on individual academic needs and tracking the progress of each student.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: 2021 Proficiency was 74%. Learning Gains were not available.

Measurable Outcome: 2022 Proficiency will be 76%. 2022 Learning Gains will be 66%. Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will be 71%

Monitoring: Data will be monitored by the school leadership team using the RTI and EWS process. Progress monitoring data will be analyzed and decisions made for instruction after each progress monitoring assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiated Instruction
2. Additional staff (class-size and federally funded)
3. Supplemental Curriculum (digital and print)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiated instruction is proven effective in supporting Tier 3 and SWD improve overall growth as part of the MTSS process.
2. Additional staff is needed to ensure Tier 2 interventions meet the teacher to student ratio.
3. Supplemental curriculum is used in preparation for statewide assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Tiered instructional services to students. Tier 2 in class. Tier 3 with Reading Endorsed teacher. Small group and one-to-one instruction.

Person Responsible: Brandi Perkins (brandis.perkins@jcsb.org)

Implement supplemental curriculums- Open Court K-2, i-Ready, STAR, Lexia. These supports are embedded during the reading block and offered for additional supports during remediation time.

Person Responsible: Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

Utilize federally funded paraprofessionals to support implementation of instructional strategies. Utilize RTI position for support of the process.

Person Responsible: Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: 2021 Proficiency was 83%. Learning gains were not available.

Measurable Outcome: 2022 Proficiency will be 85%. Learning Gains will be 88%. Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will be 76%.

Monitoring: Data will be monitored by the school leadership team using the RTI and EWS process. Progress monitoring data will be analyzed and decisions made for instruction after each progress monitoring assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiated Instruction
2. Additional staff (class-size and federally funded)
3. Supplemental Curriculum (digital and print)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiated instruction is proven effective in supporting Tier 3 and SWD improve overall growth as part of the MTSS process.
2. Additional staff is needed to ensure Tier 2 interventions meet the teacher to student ratio.
3. Supplemental curriculum is used in preparation for statewide assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Tiered instructional services to students. Tier 2 in class. Tier 3 with teacher during remediation time. Small group and one-to-one instruction.

Person Responsible

Brandi Perkins (brandis.perkins@jcsb.org)

Implement supplemental curriculums- Coachbooks and i-Ready. These supports are embedded during the reading block and offered for additional supports during remediation time.

Person Responsible

Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

Utilize federally funded paraprofessionals and RTI specialist for math interventions and classroom support. Assists with implementation of i-Ready.

Person Responsible

Melynda Howell (melynda.howell@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the low category. We try to provide positive behavior support to promote positive behavior on campus. We also have a school resource officer, Officer Keys, who is very visible across campus and has a great rapport with all students. We assess behavior on a weekly to monthly basis to help analyze what may be contributing to behavior issues and address those needs as they arise.

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.

Parents are an integral part of their child's educational team. They are invited and encouraged to attend any and all activities at Sneads Elementary School. Parent conferences, the annual Title I meeting, PTO meetings, Open House, Grade Level Orientation, School Advisory Council Meetings, field trips, class parties, fall and spring carnivals, Field Day, and special programs that include: Kindergarten and 5th grade graduation, Thanksgiving Feast, Grandparent's Day, Muffins with Mom, Donuts with Dad, Kindergarten Pow Wow, Gingerbread Houses in Kindergarten, and Writing with your child. A positive and safe school culture is always at the forefront of the choices made for our school. We welcome all stakeholders to be involved in all of our school functions, as well as our day to day activities when possible with current guidelines that might be in place. Our goal is to always have a great rapport with all of our stakeholders, as they are a vital part of our school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our stakeholders are invested in the welfare and success of our school and students. They include administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials. The stakeholders play an important role in helping to manage our school. They are the partners of the school leaders in making our school conducive to teaching and learning. They are also responsible for the achievement of the learning outcomes through their active participation in school activities, programs and projects.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00