



---

## 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>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>29</b>

# Woodward Avenue Elementary School

1201 S WOODWARD AVE, Deland, FL 32720

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/woodward/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

**Principal: Tracey Ryser**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

 \* 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 Volusia 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>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>29</b>

# Woodward Avenue Elementary School

1201 S WOODWARD AVE, Deland, FL 32720

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/woodward/pages/default.aspx>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">77%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">51%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.**

We believe each child is special. We guide our students to love learning, cooperate with each other, and respect themselves and others.

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

Creating life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

### 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
Scott, Carlos	Principal	Instructional Leader Monitor school-wide student achievement Curriculum Contact Financial Audits Professional Learning Community Lead Lead Collaborator Contact School Calendar & Events Contact School Improvement Plan Contact Re-Entry Meeting Team Member Threat Assessment Team Member Security Manual and Security Audit Teacher Evaluations Title I Budget and Audits FTE Audits Master Schedule Lead
McFall-Conte, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Monitor school-wide student achievement Curriculum Contact Professional Learning Community Lead Lead Collaborator Team Member Re-Entry Meeting Team Coordinator Threat Assessment Team Lead Security Manual and Security Audit Teacher Evaluations Title I Budget and Audits FTE Audits VSET Evaluator After hours security contact (2) AM Daily Supervision Curriculum Maps and Lesson Plans Lead Discipline DSPC Main Contact eLearning contact ESOL Supervisor School City Contact School Leadership Team Member
Hayden, Cicely	Dean	ESE Administrator Discipline Office Co-Lead (Process Referrals) In-School Suspension Coordinator After-Hours Security Contact Attendance for All Initiative co-coordinator Bloodborne Pathogens Contact Free-Reduced Lunch Contact (with Mrs. Baker) Lead Collaborator Team Member Red Ribbon Week Contact Re-Entry Meeting Team Member



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Schoolwide Discipline Team Member School Leadership Team Member Security Team Member Student Transportation Contact & Referrals Textbook Inventory Contact Threat Assessment Team Member
Woodward, Penny	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
Hall, Darnell	Teacher, K-12	Music Teacher Teach standards-aligned music instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Tutoring Facilitator
Tollison, Katie	Teacher, K-12	Assist with creating and implementing Intervention schedule for student remediation Collaborate with classroom teachers about students needing intervention supports in ELA and Math Provide students with direct instructional support using the Response to Intervention framework Use data based problem- solving model and appropriate evidence-based strategies to provide students access to core instruction Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer District progress-monitoring assessments as assigned Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/intervention plan
Cowell, Lacey	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
Stanley, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Larson, Carol	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 1/3/2018, Tracey Ryser

**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.*

**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.*

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

48

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

516

**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	56	66	75	75	77	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	4	9	5	8	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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**

Tuesday 8/10/2021

**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	0	99	106	112	100	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	9	12	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	9	12	21	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

**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	3	2	5	12	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	0	99	106	112	100	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	9	12	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	9	12	21	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

**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	3	2	5	12	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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				49%	56%	57%	50%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	56%	58%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	53%	29%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	59%	63%	59%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	56%	62%	51%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	43%	51%	33%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	57%	53%	58%	58%	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	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Elementary School Progress Monitoring Tools

English language Arts Mathematics Science

Fall Winter Spring Fall Winter Spring Fall Winter Spring

1st Grade Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 3

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3 N/A N/A N/A

2nd Grade Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 3 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool:

Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3 N/A N/A N/A

3rd Grade Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 3 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool:

Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3 N/A N/A N/A

4th Grade Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 3 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool:

Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3 N/A N/A N/A

5th Grade Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1

Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Tool: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 3 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool:

Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3 Tool: VST 1

Tool: VST 2

Tool: VST 3

i-Ready Measure: Percent of students on or above grade level for Fall, Winter and Spring

VST Measure: Percent of students proficient (70% or above)

VST= Volusia Science Test

Additional Data:

Grades 3-5 Math SMT 1 (for these grade levels Math data below includes SMT 1/i-Ready Diagnostic)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	83/22.9%	89/40.5%	90/47.78
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/19.12%	73/35.62%	72/44.44%
	Students With Disabilities	15/13.33%	16/31.25%	16/31.25%
	English Language Learners	3/0.00%	3/0.00%	4/25.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/10.26%	89/31.46%	90/50.00%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/9.38%	72/24.66%	72/44.44%
	Students With Disabilities	15/0.00%	16/43.75%	15/53.33%
	English Language Learners	3/0.00%	3/0.00%	4/37.40%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	90/33.33%	93/51.61%	90/60.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/28.38%	77/50.65%	77/61.04%
	Students With Disabilities	14/14.29%	14/28.57%	14/35.71%
	English Language Learners	10/30.00%	10/40.00%	10/60.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	88.21.59%	93/35.48%	94/51.06%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/20.83%	77/33.77%	77/49.35%
	Students With Disabilities	13/30.77%	14/14.29%	14/28.57%
	English Language Learners	9/0.00%	10/10.00%	10/30.00%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	91/48.35%	95/51.58%	101/62.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/43.24%	77/46.75%	79/58.23%
	Students With Disabilities	16/6.25%	18/5.56%	18/16.67%
	English Language Learners	12/33.33%	13/23.08%	12/16.67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	91/15.38%	94/37.23%	96/55.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/12.16%	76/34.21	75/52.00%
	Students With Disabilities	16/0.00%	17/11.76%	18/22.22%
	English Language Learners	12/0.00%	13/23.08%	12/41.67%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86/31.40%	87/36.78%	90/42.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/21.31%	62/24.19%	62/32.26%
	Students With Disabilities	19/10.53%	21/0.00%	21/19.05%
	English Language Learners	12/16.67%	12/33.33%	13/30.77%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84/20.24%	87/34.48%	92/48.91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/13.56%	62/25.81%	62/41.94%
	Students With Disabilities	20/5.00%	21/4.76%	23/26.09%
	English Language Learners	11/9.09%	12/25.00%	12/58.33%



Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93/31.18%	97/43.30%	95/46.88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/26.32%	79/35.44%	77/39.74%
	Students With Disabilities	30/10.00%	32/18.75%	30/16.67%
	English Language Learners	9/11.11%	9/33.33%	9/33.33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	95/16.84%	99/36.36%	96/53.13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/15.38%	81/32.10%	78/50.00%
	Students With Disabilities	30/13.33%	33/18.18%	28/17.86%
	English Language Learners	9/11.11%	9/22.22%	9/55.56%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	401/53%	324/61%	164/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	323/45%	261/54%	131/58%
	Students With Disabilities	99/26%	26/49%	49/35%
	English Language Learners	40/44%	35/67%	16/67%

**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	13	22	20	20	41	25	25				
ELL	21			34							
BLK	23	24	8	20	38	25	22				
HSP	48	57		43	43		60				
WHT	54	50		59	52		77				
FRL	40	39	24	41	43	19	50				
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	22	43	47	18	43	47	19				
ELL	27	24	15	30	48	64	47				
BLK	33	51	56	38	52	33	30				
HSP	38	30	8	47	53	50	45				

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
MUL	50			56							
WHT	59	53	43	61	57	53	62				
FRL	41	42	42	45	53	48	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	11	24	22	21	32	32	32				
ELL	25	40	27	50	71						
BLK	32	31	18	43	47	30	30				
HSP	44	50	31	60	56		50				
MUL	53	60		44	45						
WHT	57	53	41	66	51	41	66				
FRL	43	44	27	54	52	36	50				

### 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

When analyzing 2021 Florida Standards Assessment data, identifiable trends were evident across grade levels, ESSA subgroups, and core content areas. For example, students performing at proficiency overall in ELA and Mathematics decreased when compared to 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data. ELA student achievement decreased from 49% to 41%. Mathematics student achievement decreased from 51% to 47%. The percentage of ELA and Mathematics Lowest Quartile students performing at proficiency witnessed a significant decrease in performance when compared 2019 results.

In addition, a significant decline in overall performance in ELA and Math was noticed for Students with Disabilities and African Americans. Woodward's ELA SWD subgroup scoring at proficiency decrease from 18% to 13% to on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment. Woodward's ELA African Americans subgroup scoring at proficiency will decrease from 33% to 23%. Math achievement for African Americans witnessed a significant decline from 38% to 20%.

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

Data components that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement include ELA Achievement and Mathematics Achievement overall. An inadept analysis of all ESSA subgroups revealed Students with Disabilities and African Americans showed the greatest need for improvement in both ELA and Mathematics Achievement.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement included a high number of parents opting for their students not to participate in in-person learning during the 2019 school year, a high percentage of students were absent from school an excessive number of days, and teachers' inability to facilitate Walk to Intervention as strategy to remediate students' areas of focus as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Actions that must to occur to address this need for improvement includes implementation of a Support Facilitation Push-In Model that provides direct teacher support for Students with Disabilities during exposure to grade level standards. Implementation of Walk to Intervention for struggling students along with targeted instruction and remediation will address this need for improvement. In addition, increased practice of collaborative structures for all students will directly improve student's understanding of skills and concepts taught.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement based off progress monitoring and 2021 state assessments were Math Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities and African Americans. Science proficiency increased by 4% overall from 50% in 2019 to 54% in 2021. I-Ready Diagnostic progress-monitoring data for the 2020-2021 school year showed an increase in student performance

overall in ELA and Mathematics on each of the three assessments administered. Every grade level witnessed an increase in student performance on each assessment.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement included implementation of a Support Facilitation Push-In Model in Mathematics for 5th grade Students with Disabilities. District support in Science and Math, including many Collaborative Planning sessions in Mathematics and Science proved to be impactful. In addition, required daily usage of i-Ready's Online Learning in Mathematics for all students was a contributing factor to overall student improvement. Each of the mentioned actions were new steps our school implemented to impact student learning.

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

Woodward's School Leadership Team worked to identify different strategies to implement during the 2021-2022 school year in order to accelerate student learning. Specific strategies include implementing Walk to Intervention in ELA and Mathematics to remediate targeted skills for individual students, ensuring Support Facilitation teachers Push-in to General Education classrooms to assist SWD with learning grade level standards, teachers to use Focus Boards to display and reference standards, learning targets, and success criteria, and increase the use of collaborative structures during lesson delivery to deepen students understanding of skills and concepts taught. In addition, providing pre-printed interactive notes across curriculum and having students to track their own data in core subject areas will help to accelerate student learning.

**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.**

Professional Development opportunities during the 2021-2022 school year will focus on Teacher Clarity, Benchmark Advance, Waterford, Collaborative Structures, RULER strategies for students' Social and Emotional success, Understanding the K-5 Math IPG Data Collection Tool, Standards-aligned instruction, and Restorative Practices. Each professional learning facilitated will focus on improving instructional and Social and Emotional practices to help staff and students demonstrate growth. Professional learning will be provided during scheduled Early Release Days set by both the District and our school.

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

Additional services that will be implemented during the 2021-2022 school year to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include Title I Tutoring for Tier 2 and 3 students, Tier 1 students participation in accelerated learning activities with the Instructional Coach and Administration, and faculty participation in scheduled Collaborative Planning. Intense analyzing of student performance data to identify areas of focus for improvement will be conducted with grade level teams and individual teachers.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Focus Description and Rationale:** As a result of 2021 Florida Standards Assessment data, 41% of Woodward students scored at proficiency. This was a 8% decrease in student achievement overall when compared to 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data.

**Measurable Outcome:** ELA student achievement will increase overall from 41% to 51% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
 ELA Lower Quartile subgroup scoring at proficiency will increase from 23% to 45% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
 ELA SWD subgroup scoring at proficiency will increase from 13% to 35% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
 ELA African Americans subgroup scoring at proficiency will increase from 23% to 35% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom walk-throughs using a coaching and feedback tool with specific ELA look-fors. Scheduled data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth will be conducted during weekly PLCs and one-on-one meetings with Administration. Coaching Cycles will be implemented/monitored based on teacher needs as demonstrated through weekly classroom walk-throughs, observations, and shared student performance data. Student Math performance will be progress-monitored using District Assessments and i-Ready Diagnostic data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and a continued focus on Small Group Learning. Both evidence-based strategies, if implemented with fidelity, have the potential to considerably accelerate student learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As indicated by John Hattie's research on Visible Learning, Teacher Clarity relates to organization, explanation, examples and guided practice, and assessment of student learning. It can involve clearly communicating the intentions of the lessons and the success criteria. Clear learning intentions describe the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values that the student needs to learn. Teacher Clarity has an Effect size of 0.75 and has the potential to considerably accelerate student learning. The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. In addition, John Hattie shares Small Group Learning has an Effect size of 0.47.

Both Teacher Clarity and Small Group Learning align with Volusia County Schools Strategic Goal #1: High Quality Instruction – Engage ALL students in high levels of learning every day.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Share with faculty and staff 2021 ELA FSA data SLT members examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Provide ongoing Professional Learning on Teacher Clarity and Teacher-led Small Group instruction during ERPLs and Teacher Duty Days.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Standards, Learning Targets, and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmsscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Review Lowest 25% (especially Students with Disabilities and African Americans) data with teachers to increase awareness and to determine specific individual areas of focus for targeted Intervention support.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmsscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. K-5 teachers to participate Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers “doing the work, to know the work” to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Monitor Teacher Clarity and Small Group Learning during frequent Admin Walk-throughs and ELA Collaborative Walks to provide feedback and coaching to teachers.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmsscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Support Facilitation teachers to implement Push-in Model to ensure SWD are exposure to grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Conduct PLCs focused on progress-monitoring District and i-Ready Assessment data to determine individual students' areas of focus for intervention and support.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. The Instructional Coach will meet with the teachers weekly to discuss students' ELA performance data and to outline next steps.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As a result of 2021 Florida Standards Assessment data, 47% of Woodward students scored at proficiency. This was a 6% decrease when compared to 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data. Math Learning Gains were 45% and Math Lowest Quartile performed at 23%, which were significant decreases in performance when compared to student performance in 2019.

**Measurable Outcome:** Math student achievement overall will increase overall from 47% to 55% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
Lower Quartile subgroup scoring at proficiency Math will increase from 23% to 50% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
SWD subgroup scoring at proficiency will in Math increase from 20% to 45% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.  
African Americans subgroup scoring at proficiency in Math will increase from 20% to 45% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom walk-throughs using a coaching and feedback tool (K-5 Math IPG Data Collection Tool) with specific Mathematics look-fors. Scheduled data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth will be conducted during weekly PLCs and one-on-one meetings with Administration. Coaching Cycles will be implemented/monitored based on teacher needs as demonstrated through weekly classroom walk-throughs, observations, and shared student performance data. Student Math performance will be progress-monitored using District Assessments and i-Ready Diagnostic data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus is Problem Solving and Classroom Discussion. Implementing both strategies in the delivery of Mathematics instruction will help our faculty to provide high-quality, data driven, differentiated instruction aligned to the Florida Standards resulting in improved overall student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** John Hattie's Visible Learning research indicates Problem Solving Teaching has an Effect size of 0.68 and Classroom Discussion has an Effect size of 0.82. The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. Each research based strategy has the potential to considerably accelerate learning which will result in increased student performance in Mathematics.

**Strategy:** Both Problem Solving Teaching and Classroom Discussion align with Volusia County Schools Strategic Goal #1: High Quality Instruction – Engage ALL students in high levels of learning every day.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Share with faculty and staff 2021 FSA data allowing purposeful time for faculty to analyze, reflect, and develop grade level/individual goals for 2022 FSA.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Review Lowest 25% (especially Students with Disabilities and African Americans) data with teachers to increase awareness and to determine specific individual areas of focus for targeted Intervention support.



**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Administer i-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data to guide targeted Math instruction.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Engage teachers and Admin in Professional Learning focused on increasing understanding of the three Core Actions identified on the K-5 Math IPG Data Collection Tool.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide monthly Professional Learning focused on unpacking grade level standards to increase understanding of what students are expected to know at each grade level.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Monitor standards-aligned instruction during frequent Admin Walk-throughs and Math Collaborative Walks to provide feedback and coaching to teachers.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Support Facilitation teachers to implement Push-in Model to ensure SWD are exposure to grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Schedule Collaborative Planning for grade level teams with an emphasis on standards-alignment, planning, and tasks that will help achieve desirable student outcomes.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. The Instructional Coach will meet with the teachers weekly to discuss students' math performance data and to outline next steps.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

10. Provide training opportunities for teachers on implementing collaborative structures to deepen student learning and understanding.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

11. Conduct Learning Walks with Admin, Instructional Coach, and District Support Staff to monitor standards-alignment, tasks alignment, and collaborative structures.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

12. Students will learn to set goals and track Math data including i-Ready and District Topic Checks.

**Person Responsible** Carol Larson (cglarson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning is an area of focus because of the high number of violent incidents occurring on campus including fighting and bullying. Some students inability manage their emotions, set and achieve goals, and maintain positive relationships/interactions with others have resulted in a high number of discipline referrals in both categories.

**Measurable Outcome:** The total number of discipline referrals for violent incidents (Hitting/Striking and Insubordination) during 2021-2022 school year will decrease 25% from 199 to 149. Hitting/Striking and Insubordination are two discipline offenses that are a direct result of student frustration and lack of self-control.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through the use of quarterly surveys for both students and staff. Classroom Walk-throughs with PBIS team will be conducted to monitor full implementation of RULER strategies within the classroom setting. Staff participation in Restorative Practices Professional Learning will be required to help start dialogue about how to improve student-teacher interactions. Professional Learning sign-in sheets will be collected and reviewed by administration. School-wide Discipline Data will be collected and shared frequently with all staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus is Self-Efficacy and Teacher Credibility. Implementing both strategies to change both teacher-student attitudes, perceptions, and actions in regards to misbehavior will help to improve school climate and culture resulting in improved overall student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** According to John Hattie's research on Visible Learning, Self-Efficacy with the individual belief in his/her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific attachments as it relates to goals has a 0.65 Effect Size. When addressing Teacher Credibility (Effect size of 1.09) , John Hattie shares, "Students who regard their teacher as a credible authority based on their perceptions of competence, trustworthiness, and perceived caring. "Is this teacher someone I can turn to for feedback, help, knowledge, and depth of understanding?" "Am I prepared to invest in her or his assigned tasks to enhance my learning?" To have a positive school climate focused on improving and learning, both students and staff must trust and have a genuine care for one another success.

Self-Efficacy and Teacher Credibility both align to Volusia County Schools Strategic Goal #2: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Self-Efficacy and Teacher Credibility both have the potential to considerably accelerate student learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue implementation of RULER strategies including use of Class Charter and Mood Meter.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Provide training to support full implementation of Superstar 200 Club to help students and staff clearly understand Woodward's PBIS Expectations.

**Person Responsible** Carol Larson (cglarson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Share incident data with teachers monthly at faculty meetings to increase awareness and to brainstorm plans of action to eliminate unwanted behaviors.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Engage faculty in Restorative Practices Professional Learning to help build community and to provide opportunities for teacher-student dialogue focused on responding to challenging behaviors.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Teachers to complete and submit Behavior Management Plans with class expectations, rewards, and consequences for student misbehavior.

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Implement school-wide consequences that do not interfere/result in the loss of instruction for students (morning/after school detentions and/or Saturday school).

**Person Responsible** Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. School-wide training on Sanford Harmony for teacher use within classroom setting.

**Person Responsible** Laura Bastow (lmbastow@volusia.k12.fl.us)

### 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.

**After comparing Woodward's SESIR Incident and Discipline Data to other schools across the state, we have identified fighting and campus disruptions as areas of concern. Woodward's 2020-2021 District Discipline Data showed a high number of referrals for hitting/striking (116) and direct insubordination (83). Woodward's School Leadership Team plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:**

**School will:**

- Continue to implement our Superstar 200 Behavior Management System school-wide reinforcing positive behavior immediately by rewarding and recognizing students.**
- Continue implementation of our House System to eliminate unwanted behaviors.**
- Train teachers in Restorative Circle strategy**
- Identify mentors for students with high incidents in fighting**
- Provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings**

**Teachers will:**

- Work to build positive relationships with students while stressing the importance of students talking about their emotions.**
- Develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without fighting.**
- Monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways and during recess.**

**Data chats will take place quarterly during faculty meetings to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the data.**

## **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.**

As our Woodward family continues to build momentum towards enhancing student learning, our commitment is to develop positive relationships with parents, families, and the community by creating a warm, nurturing, and safe environment that meets the needs of all students. Our school community will achieve this welcoming experience by ensuring all members of the Woodward family understand their role and

responsibility in the school-home partnership.

Woodward Avenue Elementary strives to involve all stakeholders in the planning, review, and improvement of the school, Title I programs, and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. Stakeholders are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, Twitter, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the meetings to guide the writing of the plan.

Parents, guardians, and other community members are invited to attend monthly School Advisory Council meetings to learn about school news and to provide input when creating the School Improvement Plan. Parent input is solicited when considering school-based activities, events, and how to use School Improvement funding to support/enhance instruction.

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

Our school’s dedicated Parent Engagement Liaison's primary role is to provide a link for families to connect to the school, assess community needs, and pair resources to support families. Information gathered from parents is used in the development of activities and workshops outlined in our List of Parent and Family Engagement Activities for each school year. The Parent Engagement Liaison helps maintain and monitor our Parent Resource Room that includes essential items such as food, clothing, and personal hygiene products to make immediate impacts. Our goal is to ensure that families’ basic needs are met, so that students are able to focus and learn.

The master schedule is created for teachers to have common planning. This allows for instructors to desegregate data together to put a plan in place for student success. The leadership team seeks feedback from teachers in order to allow for opportunities to assume leadership roles. PLC groups meet weekly to plan and discuss student data to find patterns that will help increase student achievement. Teachers are provided training, resources as needed, and support from the administration team. Discipline data is another data resource that is reviewed frequently to discuss what is working and what may need to be changed.

The leadership team meets at least once per month to identify additional needs of the student population. Title I funds may be used to support extended learning and remediation materials and/or professional development and academic coaches. When Migrant children enroll, the Title I Migrant staff ensures that students receive a fair and equitable opportunity to achieve a high-quality education and assistance transitioning to post-secondary education or employment. The Multicultural Department assists in the identification of at-risk Limited English Proficiency (LEP), immigrant, and Native American students.

**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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>