Broward County Public Schools

Sheridan Hills Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sheridan Hills Elementary School

5001 THOMAS ST, Hollywood, FL 33021

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Josetta Campbell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
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 Broward 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

Sheridan Hills Elementary School

5001 THOMAS ST, Hollywood, FL 33021

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 siersion 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.

Sheridan Hills is committed to provide a stimulating, interesting, diversified and relevant curriculum designed to ensure that every child reaches their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sheridan Hills supports the district's vision of educating today's students for tomorrow's world.

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
Campbell, Josetta	Principal	The Principal's role is to establish and monitor the school's mission and goals that are aligned to the District's mission and goals. The duties and responsibilities of the principal are to work collaboratively with staff to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, and student learning.
Stramanak, Annmarie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal role is to establish and monitor the school's mission and goals that are aligned to the District's mission and goals. The duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal are to work collaboratively with the principal to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, and student learning.
Gomez, Lisa	Reading Coach	The Literacy Coach's job duties and responsibilities are to provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers and students. The Literacy Coach also assists teachers in reflecting on and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2012, Josetta Campbell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school
482

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

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	71	82	92	76	77	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	30	20	22	10	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	15	11	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	7	11	4	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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				55%	59%	57%	52%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	60%	58%	57%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	54%	53%	69%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	65%	63%	57%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	66%	62%	58%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	42%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	46%	53%	58%	49%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	67%	3%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	64%	0%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used for each grade level is IReady.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/50.7	82/47.3	82/65
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/48.1	60/49.1	60/64
	Students With Disabilities	11/50	11/20	11/50
	English Language Learners	16/42.9	16/30.8	16/37.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/24.7	82/28	82/42.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/24.1	60/22.2	60/39.3
	Students With Disabilities	11/40	11/20	11/30
	English Language Learners	16/21.4	16/14.3	16/13.3

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92/36.5	92/42	92/57
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/35.4	71/38.2	71/58
	Students With Disabilities	15/33.3	15/33.3	15/60
	English Language Learners	14/25	14/25	14/50.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92/34.9	92/38	92/42
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/31.3	71/35	71/38.2
	Students With Disabilities	15/20	15/28.6	15/35.7
	English Language Learners	14/66.6	14/9.1	14/23.1

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/50.7	76/67.6	76/71
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/49	59/65.4	59/67.9
	Students With Disabilities	10/20	10/40	10/50
	English Language Learners	17/21.4	17/20	17/43.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/10.4	76/41.2	76/65.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/13.7	59/32.7	59/59.3
	Students With Disabilities	10/0	10/20	10/50
	English Language Learners	17/7.1	17/26.7	17/37.5

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/28.6	77/41.1	77/48
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/26.1	50/32.6	50/41.7
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.3	12/16.7	12/25
	English Language Learners	10/0	10/0	10/10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/27.1	77/33.8	77/42.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/21.7	50/28.9	50/35.4
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.3	12/0	12/8.3
	English Language Learners	10/0	10/10	10/20

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/31.2	84/34.2	84/41.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/29.8	62/32.8	62/41.4
	Students With Disabilities	16/13.3	16/13.3	16/33.3
	English Language Learners	9/12.5	9/12.5	9/22.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/24	84/31.6	84/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/20	62/31.6	62/50.9
	Students With Disabilities	16/14.3	16/20	16/28.6
	English Language Learners	9/0	9/14.3	9/33.3
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	22	21		19	14		46				
ELL	46	32		38	21		30				
ASN	80										
BLK	39	57		33	29		14				
HSP	47	39	33	38	24		38				
WHT	53	36		50	9		36				
FRL	42	36	25	34	20	7	33				
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	23	55	71	43	61	44	15				
ELL	43	67	53	63	84	69	26				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	57	61		70	71		21				
HSP	51	63	57	68	81	61	50				
WHT	59	71		70	71		71				
FRL	54	65	63	68	77	56	47				
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	16	42	50	22	46	36	31				
ELL	33	49	68	42	40	31	58				
BLK	43	48		51	52	36	30				
HSP	51	58	68	60	61	39	67				
WHT	57	65		56	58		67				
FRL	50	55	67	56	56	41	63				

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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	270
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	94%
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	35
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
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?

After reviewing the data, reading, math and science proficiency has decreased across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas.

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

Based on the data, the greatest need for improvement is ELA. Improvement in ELA and reading techniques and strategies will indirectly lead to improvement in other core content areas.

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 contributing factors include the pandemic and challenges with the virtual learning environment including absenteeism. Our actions include: remediation of identified students by reading and math resource teachers using identified intervention programs, implementation of all core reading program components with fidelity and monitored by administration.

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

There were no areas of improvement as there was a decrease in all core content areas.

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

N/A

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

Student learning will be accelerated through the implementation of standards focused, flexible small groups in reading and math.

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.

The scheduled professional development opportunities that will be provided include: R.T.I process, Core Reading Program (Benchmark Advance), Small Group Reading Strategies, planning and implementing Accelerated Reader.

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

To ensure sustainability teachers will receive ongoing coaching and support in areas identified by a "Needs Assessment" given.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA has been identified as an area of critical need based on 2021 FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students scoring a level 3 or higher in ELA will increase from 47% to 57% by June 2022 as measured by F.S.A.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored for desired outcome through monthly progress monitoring to identify areas of strengths and weakness.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josetta Campbell (josetta.campbell@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced based strategy that will be utilized is guided reading groups that are adjusted based on progress monitoring data and ESSER pull out groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected because they are standards focused to identify areas of weaknesses. When they are identified, through monthly progress monitoring, students will receive immediate small group support. This strategy will also allow for enrichment for students who master standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule baseline assessment and monitor baseline data with leadership team and classroom teachers.

Person Responsible	Annmarie Stramanak (annmarie.stramanak@browardschools.com)

Assist classroom teacher with identifying student needs and creating small groups.

Person Responsible	Lisa Gomez (lisa.gomez@browardschools.com)

Schedule monthly progress monitoring and data chats.

Person Responsible	Annmarie Stramanak (annmarie.stramanak@browardschools.com)

Assist classroom teachers with restructuring small groups based on monthly progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Lisa Gomez (lisa.gomez@browardschools.com)

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.

The school culture and environment will be monitored through the implementation of positive behavior techniques (Wake Up Wednesday, Flip Its and 10- Minutes of Mindfulness). These techniques are a part of the schoolwide behavior plan and will be monitored through this plan.

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.

Sheridan Hills Elementary will focus on building a positive school culture and environment by taking the time to establish rapport with students and families. Throughout the day students will have positive interactions with faculty and staff through the use of positive reinforcement, rewards and the utilization of relaxation and breathing techniques with students become stressed and need a moment to regroup.

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

School Leadership Team- Training and setting of goals
Assistant Principal- Monitoring of goals
Guidance Counselor- Modeling of school culture and techniques
Classroom Teachers and Staff- Daily implementation and use positive behavior techniques

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$5,610.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336		1811 - Sheridan Hills Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds	482.0	$5,610.00
			Notes: Purchase I-Ready Toolkit to support classroom ELA instruction for kindergarten to 5th grade. It is a companion to the i-Ready program already in use school-wide.			
					Total:	$5,610.00