Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

49 HOMESTEAD RD S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://vpa.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Edwin Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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

Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

49 HOMESTEAD RD S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://vpa.leeschools.net//

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

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

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.

At Veterans Park Academy for the Arts, we strive to provide every student an avenue to success through academics, creative and expressive arts, and athletics.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Veterans Park Academy for the Arts partners with families and the community to develop productive and creative global citizens.

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
Carter, Edwin	Principal	
Kustra, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	
Lundy, Helen	Assistant Principal	
Macchia, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Mendes, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/20/2021, Edwin Carter

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.*
32

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,895

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

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

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	167	157	157	175	186	184	355	249	265	0	0	0	0	1895
Attendance below 90 percent	10	26	25	29	18	26	54	15	30	0	0	0	0	233
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	13	13	14	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	1	14	8	30	18	8	39	3	7	0	0	0	0	128
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	22	25	13	32	3	11	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	41	61	110	40	82	0	0	0	0	344
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	49	57	139	101	80	0	0	0	0	435
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	7	5	25	45	47	115	46	68	0	0	0	0	359

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	1	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				54%	62%	61%	54%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	60%	59%	54%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	53%	54%	43%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				56%	62%	62%	56%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				60%	61%	59%	59%	55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	52%	51%	52%	52%
Science Achievement				43%	54%	56%	40%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	78%	78%	70%	75%	77%

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	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2021					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2021					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	58%	-13%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	46%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	49%	46%	3%	48%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.7	22/21.0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/3.9	12/11.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	25/16.6	51/31.1	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/3.7	4/13.8	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	9/6.0	14/8.6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1	1/7.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/7.4	1/3.4	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	33/21.4	61.37.4	79/47.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	2/7.7	5/19.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/15.4	3/23
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	12/7.9	31/19.3	50/30.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	3/11.5	3/11.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/8.3	3/23.1

Grade 4

English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/26.8	37/31.6	50/42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/3.2	4/12.9
	English Language Learners	1/7.1	1/6.7	2/13.3

Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/5.8	19/17.3	27/23.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2.7.1	2/6.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5

English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/19	59/30.3	72/40.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/2.9	1/2.9	3/8.6
	English Language Learners	1/4.8	2/9.5	4/19.0

Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/2.5	24/13.8	39/22.0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/5.9
	English Language Learners	1/4.8	1/4.8	2/9.5

Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/17.4	43/25.4	67/39.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/3.1	1/3.1	3/9.7
	English Language Learners	2/10	0/0	1/5.0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73/39.5	86/44.3	85/43.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/22.7	9/34.6	5/20
	English Language Learners	2/10.5	4/18.2	1/4.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	1/3.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97/46.0	88/40.6	111/49.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/14.3	2/6.9	2/6.7
	English Language Learners	2/9.5	3/13.6	3/13.6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/27	85/35.9	102/42
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/3.6	3/10.3	5/17.2
	English Language Learners	1/5.0	2/9.1	4/18.2
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	98/58	130/70.3	144/81.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/23.5	5/29.4	9/60
	English Language Learners	5/35.7	7/46.7	10/66.7

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/49.0	84/53.5	103/62.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/7.4	2/6.7	6/20
	English Language Learners	2/18.2	2/18.2	2/18.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/41	98/42.4	113/47.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/6.7	2/6.1	4/12.1
	English Language Learners	3/14.3	3/14.3	4/19.0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.21.8	88/34.2	119/45.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/9.4	3/9.4
	English Language Learners	1/5.3	1/5.0	5/25.0

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	11	27	27	15	29	35	9	31			
ELL	26	40	37	29	42	39	22	54			
BLK	38	46	37	33	32	33	21	63	46		
HSP	46	48	35	41	42	39	37	66	56		
MUL	59	63		46	35		80				
WHT	49	53	38	52	34	41	44	71	64		
FRL	41	47	33	36	35	37	30	63	52		
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	21	44	38	26	49	51	22	48			
ELL	38	49	42	40	44	40	25	69			
ASN	85	100		77	82						

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
BLK	49	53	49	50	61	52	45	67	61		
HSP	53	57	47	56	57	50	39	77	56		
MUL	69	58		60	71						
WHT	58	59	38	64	66	64	49	78	55		
FRL	50	54	50	51	56	54	36	74	65		

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	21	40	35	25	44	42	13	34			
ELL	31	51	48	45	48	32	8				
ASN	73	64		73	64						
BLK	52	52	45	51	60	55	25	65	64		
HSP	53	54	42	57	58	49	42	73	69		
MUL	82	84		79	80		64				
WHT	52	51	44	59	57	50	52	66	75		
FRL	52	53	42	54	58	50	37	67	68		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	37

English Language Learners	
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	40
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	46
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	42
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?

From 2019-2021, both VPAA and Lee Co. District scores decreased in every school grade component. VPAA's subjects showing the greatest opportunities for growth are Math and Science Achievement. A component showing VPAA's greatest strength is Social Studies Achievement.

In comparison to the Lee Co. District average, VPAA showed a greater decrease in Achievement than it did in Learning Gains. In fact, VPAA had a higher percentage of students making ELA Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains than the the Lee Co. District average. This trend is likely due to the difference in school and district demographics. Lost learning over the past two years had a greater negative effect on the Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. While the district has 69% economically disadvantaged, VPAA has 92%. The district has 11.7% students with disabilities, compared to VPAA which has 15.4%. Therefore, that negative effect presented more so in VPAA's Achievement levels than the district average.

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

VPAA's subjects showing the greatest opportunities for growth are Math and Science Achievement. This need for improvement emerged in 2018, and has consistently presented opportunities for growth.

For Math Achievement, VPAA fell 2% below the district average in 2018, then fell 3% below in 2019, and finally fell to 7% below the district average in 2021. Progress monitoring data (i.e. iReady, STAR) somewhat predicted these results, with actual results (41%) a bit higher than iReady/STAR predicted (35%).

For Science Achievement, VPAA fell 15% below the district average in 2018, then fell 10% below in 2019, and finally fell to 13% below the district average in 2021. Progress monitoring data somewhat predicted these results, with actual results (36%) falling between what the Quarter 2 (31%) and Quarter 3 (44%) Progress Monitoring windows predicted.

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

The main contributing factor to this need for improvement is the loss of Face-to-Face instructional time due to the pandemic. Prior to the pandemic, Math achievement was already a need for improvement. Nationally, unfinished learning affected Math more than ELA in grades 3 and beyond. Therefore, VPAA's already growing need for improvement in Math grew. New actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement are increasing instructional time to make up for

unfinished learning. To do this, VPAA is tutoring students (Face-to--Face) before school, during P.E. or elective periods, and after school. Highly effective teachers, coaches, and PCTs are hired for this additional make-up of instruction.

Teachers are the primary factor influencing student achievement. Consequently, other factors that contributed to this need for improvement were inadequate instruction due to a lack of teacher content knowledge, teacher absences, and teacher turnover. Beyond pedagogy, teachers must know and understand the content they are teaching. They firstly must be present, in order to provide stability and continuity for students. New actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement are strategically placing teachers with not only the pedagogical knowledge but also the content knowledge needed into core Math and Science classes. Ongoing support will come from Math and Science Coaches at both the school and district levels.

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

VPAA's component showing the most improvement is Social Studies Achievement. This need for improvement emerged in 2018, and has consistently presented a strength for VPAA.

For Social Studies Achievement, VPAA grew 3% above the district average in 2018, then grew 6% above in 2019, and finally grew 4% above the district average in 2021. Progress monitoring data somewhat predicted these results, with actual results (66%) falling between what the Quarter 2 (56%) and Quarter 3 (76%) Progress Monitoring windows predicted.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were the teachers. The teachers had pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and their instruction was aligned to the Social Studies Standards/ Benchmarks. They used the Test Item Specifications to plan and assess learning. Their interim assessments were aligned to the statewide summative assessment, allowing them to adjust instruction based on student needs. These teachers truly utilized a model of Backwards Design, keeping the end in mind throughout the year.

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

To increase math fluency, students in Grades 2-8 will engage in Reflex Math and/or Frax Math. Adaptive and individualized, Reflex is the most effective system for mastering basic facts in addition, subtraction, multiplication and division for grades 2 and beyond. Reflex takes students at every level and helps them quickly gain math fact fluency and confidence. Also adaptive and individualized, Frax Math uses the latest research-based instructional methods to create a better way to learn fractions. Fractions knowledge in grade 5 uniquely predicts student success in Algebra and beyond. Yet assessments show chronic struggles with fractions from grade 3 onward. With Frax, students come to understand that fractions are numbers too. The other computer adaptive program used to support math instruction is iReady. iReady delivers online lessons that provide tailored instruction and practice for each student to accelerate growth. It supports teachers with in-the-moment resources for remediation and reteaching at individualized, small group, and whole class levels of instruction.

In addition to computer-adaptive programs, another strategy used will be standards-based instruction through the model of backwards design. Students will receive this instruction, assessment, and intervention during the school day; however, select students will receive additional interventions during our tutoring sessions that begin at the end of quarter one with highly effective teachers. Khan Academy middle school math. Intervention programs such as Read 180 and System 44 are used in Grades 3-8.

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.

For computer-adaptive programs, VPAA will support teachers and leaders with professional development specialists with Reflex/Frax Math and iReady Math. This professional development will have follow-up opportunities through our coaches and PCTs. After a month of implementation, specific teachers will receive coaching support based on program data.

Standards-based instruction through the model of backwards design will be supported by school and district coaches. They are attending PLCs to facilitate planning, data analysis, and intervention. To support the "HOW" our Coaches, Specialists, and PCTs will model, co-teach and take teachers on learning walks. They will target Student Engagement in Semester One and Questioning in Semester Two (See h. below)

VPAA utilizes Leading & Learning reps and Coaches & Contacts for distributed leadership. They serve as liaisons between the district Curriculum and Instruction Department and our school. Leading & Learning reps bring back PD to their grade level teams as our PCTs and Coaches support them in this leadership role.

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

To sustain this improvement, we will need to retain our most effective teachers. One reason for teacher turnover is lack of support; therefore VPAA's coaches and PCTs will engage all teachers with learning walks. This year, they will target Student Engagement in Semester One and Questioning in Semester Two.

For student engagement, teachers "look-fors" during their learning walks will be the following:
• Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem solving, etc.
• Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and invite students to explain their thinking
• Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and persistent even when the tasks are challenging
• Students actively "working," rather than watching while their teacher "works"
• Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragged out nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection

For questioning, teachers "look-fors" during their learning walks will be the following:
• Questions of high cognitive challenge, formulated by both students and teacher
• Questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches, even when there is a single correct response
• Effective use of student responses and ideas
• Discussion, with the teacher stepping out of the central, mediating role
• Focus on the reasoning exhibited by students in discussion, both in give-and-take with the teacher and with their classmates
• High levels of student participation in discussion

With additional Title I funds, we will be able to hire additional PCTs to grow our support plan.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For Math Achievement, VPAA fell from 56% in 2019 to 41% in 2021. Math Learning Gains fell from 60% in 2019 to 38% in 2021. Math Lowest 25% Learning gains fell from 53% in 2019 to 36% in 2021. While other school grade components declined as well, the three components in math (i.e. Achievement, Learning Gains, Lowest 25% Learning Gains) show the greatest need for Veterans Park Academy for the Arts.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Mathematics proficiency to at least 56% of students in meeting or exceeding standards by May 2022 as measured by Spring 2022 Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments. Increase Mathematics learning gains to at least 60% of students demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 Mathematics Florida Standards Assessments and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments. Increase Mathematics learning gains to at least 53% of students in VPAA's lowest 25% demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 Mathematics Florida Standards Assessments and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored using the predictive value of iReady Diagnostic Assessments (STAR for Algebra) and the more frequent use of the District Math Exemplar Assessments. These can be analyzed through the iReady/Renaissance Place platforms as well as through Performance Matters Unify and CASTLE Power-Bi platforms. The Baseball Card Report and Scorecard Report within the Performance Matters Unify platform will be used for the triangulation of data each interim and at the end of each quarter. Data within CASTLE Power-Bi will analyzed after our three District Progress Monitoring Windows.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly school-wide Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will cycle through targets, evidence, and actions, using these guiding questions: 1. STANDARDS: What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. ASSESSMENT: How will we know if they learn it? 3. INSTRUCTION: How will we teach it 4. RESPONSE: How will we reteach, accelerate, or extend learning? Peer Collaborative Teachers, Coaches, or Specialists will collaboratively plan and support all Math PLCs. Targeted classroom teachers will include coaching. (T) These PLC cycles will lead to increased learning gains by students in Mathematics, as determined by iReady Diagnostic Assessments (STAR for Algebra) and Spring 2022 FSA and EOC scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A Professional Learning Community is an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of d=1.57 Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement. PLCs allow for teachers to have a collaborative conversation based on evidence. Together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe that they can do so. DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional

Learning Communities at Work (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Hattie, J. (December 2017) VisibleLearningPlus.com

Action Steps to Implement

1. In collaboration with a PCT, Coach, or Specialist, each PLC will plan for standards-based instruction. Through the model of Backward Design, PLCs will use the District Exemplar Assessment to plan for instruction.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

2. Teachers will teach utilizing best practices and high yield strategies. Targeted classroom teachers will be coached by a PCT, Coach, or Specialist. Teachers will administer the District Exemplar Assessment to assess learning.

Person Responsible   Andrea Cruz (andrearc@leeschools.net)

3. PLCs will analyze the results of exemplar. A PCT, Coach, or Specialist will facilitate this data analysis. The Comparative Results and the Student Item Analysis reports within the Performance Matters Unify platform allow for the stratification of data.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

4. Based on the results of the District Exemplar Assessment, PLCs will adapt their instruction and teachers will reteach standards in targeted small groups for intervention. Teachers will re-assess learning, and PLCs will use the data to reflect on the interventions.

Person Responsible   Andrea Cruz (andrearc@leeschools.net)

5. Instructional time will be added for students who have not yet mastered the assessed standards. This time will be added from Breakfast Bunch, Enrichment Time (P.E. Waiver), and After School Tutoring. A PCT, Coach, or Specialist will guide the PLC in identifying areas for acceleration in each targeted group of students. (T)

For students in the Lowest 25% subgroup, they will additionally participate in evening, at-home Reflex Math and Frax Math Challenges.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For English Language Arts Achievement, VPAA fell from 54% in 2019 to 45% in 2021. English Language Arts Learning Gains fell from 57% in 2019 to 49% in 2021. English Language Arts Lowest 25% Learning gains fell from 46% in 2019 to 35% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase English Language Arts proficiency to at least 55% of students in meeting or exceeding standards by May 2022 as measured by Spring 2022 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessments. Increase English Language Arts learning gains to at least 58% of students demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessments. Increase English Language Arts learning gains to at least 54% of students in VPAA's lowest 25% demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessments.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored using iReady Diagnostic Assessments and the more frequent use of the iReady Standards Mastery Assessments. These can be analyzed through the iReady platform as well as through Performance Matters Unify and CASTLE Power-Bi platforms. The Baseball Card Report and Scorecard Report within the Performance Matters Unify platform will be used for the triangulation of data each interim and at the end of each quarter. Data within CASTLE Power-Bi will analyzed after our three District Progress Monitoring Windows.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will receive tiered support to ensure they are given the supports they need to succeed in English Language Arts. All students will receive rigorous instruction aligned to grade level standards and text complexity. Small group instruction based upon progress-monitoring data will be used to improve student achievement. Students with severe deficits in reading will receive interventions in a research-based reading program. Peer Collaborative Teachers, Coaches, or Specialists will collaboratively plan and support all ELA PLCs. Targeted classroom teachers will include coaching. (T) Two additional Reading Teachers, Four additional paraprofessionals, and an Intervention Specialist will be used daily to support Lowest 25% subgroup and students identified as struggling to meet grade level expectations (T).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This tiered support will lead to increased learning gains by students in English Language Arts, as determined by iReady Diagnostic Assessments and Spring 2022 FSA scores. Students will receive targeted direct small group instruction utilizing best strategic practices embedded throughout the standards based lesson. Students who are reading below grade level will be provided the support they need to read texts at grade level complexity and apply standards to demonstrate their understanding of the text. Students will be scaffolded with questions rather than answers to do so. (D. Coleman and S. Pimentel) For students without a command of foundational reading skills, they will receive extensive

instruction and practice in those skills required to achieve fluency and comprehension. These students need code-based, explicit, systematic and sequential instruction in reading. (N. Young, "The Ladder of Reading" 2017) We have adopted Read 180 and System 44 as our research-based reading programs to support our students with severe reading deficits. WWC Intervention Report found that READ 180 has positive effects on comprehension and general literacy achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. In collaboration with a PCT, Coach, or Specialist, each PLC will plan for standards-based instruction. Through the model of Backward Design, PLCs will use the District Exemplar Assessment to plan for instruction.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

2. Teachers will teach utilizing best practices and high yield strategies. Targeted classroom teachers will be coached by a PCT, Coach, or Specialist. Teachers will administer the District Exemplar Assessment to assess learning.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

3. PLCs will analyze the results of exemplar. A PCT, Coach, or Specialist will facilitate this data analysis. The Comparative Results and the Student Item Analysis reports within the Performance Matters Unify platform allow for the stratification of data.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

4. Based on the results of the District Exemplar Assessment, PLCs will adapt their instruction and teachers will reteach standards in targeted small groups for intervention. Teachers will re-assess learning, and PLCs will use the data to reflect on the interventions.

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

5. Instructional time will be added for students who have not yet mastered the assessed standards. This time will be added from Breakfast Bunch, Enrichment Time (P.E. Waiver), and After School Tutoring. A PCT, Coach, or Specialist will guide the PLC in identifying areas for acceleration in each targeted group of students. (T)

Person Responsible   Rebecca Mendes (rebeccajm@leeschools.net)

For students with severe comprehension deficits (two or more years below grade level), they will receive small group instruction using the research-based reading program, Read 180. Progress will be monitored using the Comprehension Skills Report.

For students with decoding deficits, they will receive small group instruction using the code-based, explicit, systematic and sequential instruction using System 44. Progress will be monitored using DIBELS Fluency.

Person Responsible   Andrea Cruz (andrearc@leeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Acceleration Points	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For Acceleration Points, VPAA fell from 57% in 2019 to 56% in 2021. In 2019, VPAA was 11% below the district average in that component, and in 2021 VPAA was 9% below the district average in that component.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students who passed a high school level EOC assessment or industry certification to at least 65%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored using course codes in Focus. These can be analyzed through Castle's Power-Bi platform. Achievement in these course codes is being monitored using iReady Diagnostic Assessments, STAR Assessments, and District Exemplar Assessments. These can be analyzed through the iReady platform, Renaissance Place platform, and Performance Matters Unify.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategic placing of students and scheduling them into the most appropriate course will be a priority. Once placed into a course for Middle School Acceleration, PLCs and coaching will ensure achievement. Use of the coaching cycle for collaborative planning, modeling, followup, and monitoring through instructional chats and observational data. The curriculum maps will also serve as a guide to ensure correct pacing of instruction throughout the school year. Collaborative planning will help teachers develop clarity and establish learning targets for their students, both of which have effect sizes greater than .40 which is proven to boost student achievement based upon John Hattie's Visible Learning research. When teachers have a clear understanding of what students are expected to master at their grade level, their instructional practices are more targeted. The continuous feedback from observational data will also guide teachers to refine their practices within the coaching cycles Peer Collaborative Teachers, Coaches, or Specialists will collaboratively plan and support all Math PLCs. Targeted classroom teachers will include coaching. (T) These PLC cycles will lead to increased learning gains by students in Mathematics, as determined by the STAR Assessment and Spring 2022 EOC scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By giving guidance and job-embedded professional development to teachers in regards to planning and implementing standards-aligned instruction, the students will benefit from a more engaging, rigorous learning environment with opportunities to show mastery of standards. DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree. Hattie, J. (December 2017) VisibleLearningPlus.com

Action Steps to Implement

Previous FSA and district assessment data will be disaggregated to find students who may enter into Algebra. The platform through CASTLE Power-Bi may also be used to identify these students.

Person Responsible   Jaclyn Kustra (jaclynk@leeschools.net)

Weekly school-wide Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will cycle through targets, evidence, and actions, using these guiding questions:
1. STANDARDS: What do we want our students to know and be able to do?
2. ASSESSMENT: How will we know if they learn it?
3. INSTRUCTION: How will we teach it
4. RESPONSE: How will we reteach, accelerate, or extend learning?

Person Responsible   Jaclyn Kustra (jaclynk@leeschools.net)

At the end of Quarter One, district assessment data will be disaggregated to find students who may enter into Algebra. The platform through CASTLE Power-Bi may also be used to identify these students.

Person Responsible   Jaclyn Kustra (jaclynk@leeschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For VPAA's Students with Disabilities, English Language Arts Learning Gains, VPAA fell from 44.1% in 2019 to 26.7% in 2021. This is a drop in over 17%. For VPAA's Students with Disabilities, English Language Arts Lowest 25% Learning gains fell from 38.1% in 2019 to 27.1% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase SWD English Language Arts learning gains to at least 44% of students demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessments. Increase SWD English Language Arts learning gains to at least 38% of students in VPAA's lowest 25% demonstrating gains from one year to the next as measured by the Spring 2021 and Spring 2022 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessments.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored using iReady Diagnostic Assessments and the more frequent use of the iReady Standards Mastery Assessments. These can be analyzed through the iReady platform as well as through Performance Matters Unify and CASTLE Power-Bi platforms. The Baseball Card Report and Scorecard Report within the Performance Matters Unify platform will be used for the triangulation of data each interim and at the end of each quarter. Data within CASTLE Power-Bi will analyzed after our three District Progress Monitoring Windows.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted small group instruction with lessons based off standards driven strategic practice and evidence-based practices will be used to teach students with disabilities: 1. Control of task difficulty 2. Small, interactive groups 3. Think alouds 4. Advanced organizers/activate prior knowledge 5. Self monitoring 6. Presentation of learning in multiple ways 7. Memory strategies 8. Use of student interests 9. Collaboration with IEP team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These stated strategies do the following: o Hold all students to high academic standards; o Prepare all students for success in college and career; o Guarantee that steps are taken to help students improve; and o Hold educators accountable for student outcomes. Individualized supports are provided to students with significant disabilities to enable them to fully participate and make progress within the general education curriculum. Students receive instructional support in the general education classroom or other inclusive activities and environments. Jorgensen, C.M., McSheehan, M., Schuh, M., & Sonnenmeier, R.M. (2012). Essential Best Practices in Inclusive Schools.
Action Steps to Implement	

Provide classroom teachers with a copy of the student's current IEP. The classroom teacher and ESE Teacher will collaborate to ensure that they understand the student's academic and/or social/emotional goals as well as their accommodations for classroom assignments/assessments and standardized assessments so that they are being addressed and met by both teachers.

Person Responsible   Helen Lundy (helenml@leeschools.net)

Students on Standard-Assessment will push-in to Gen Ed classrooms strategically. They will also participate in all of the same Progress Monitoring and Exemplars as well.

1. Data Review
2. Test specs and design standards based lessons.
3. Identify area of greatest need.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports.
5. Progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Helen Lundy (helenml@leeschools.net)

ELA & Math Academic support tutoring beginning October – April 2021 to target students in grades 3-8 (T)

Instructional time will be added for students who have not yet mastered the assessed standards. This time will be added from Breakfast Bunch, Enrichment Time (P.E. Waiver), and After School Tutoring. A PCT, Coach, or Specialist will guide the PLC in identifying areas for acceleration in each targeted group of students. They will additionally participate in evening, at-home Reflex Math and Frax Math Challenges.

Person Responsible   Helen Lundy (helenml@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

In the 2020-2021 school year, Veterans Park Academy for the Arts experienced 892 discipline occurrences that resulted in a discipline referral. There have been a decline in the number of referrals for two years. In the 2019-2020 school year, there were 1381 discipline occurrences that resulted in a referral. In the 2018-2019 school year, 1458 incidences were reported. Of those 892 referrals from the 2020-20201 school year, 312 infractions were classified as "Disruptive Behavior." Some of the primary areas of concern were the student/ teacher interactions.

Classroom instruction, as well as student and teacher relationships is a key factor on how students behave in the classroom. For the upcoming school year, the administrative staff have been strategically walking through classrooms to observe the environment, as well as meeting with the PLC teams to ensure effective instruction is happening in the classroom. Our PBIS team is also providing incentives for students to help increase appropriate behavior, then in turn increase student achievement. Parental involvement has been difficult the past two years, but our school continues to plan virtual events so parent can be more involved with their child's education.

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.

.

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

.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Acceleration Points	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00