Sunland Park Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sunland Park Academy

919 NW 13TH TER, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

http://sunlandpark.browardschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Nikia Ragin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-3
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)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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.](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

Sunland Park Academy

919 NW 13TH TER, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

http://sunlandpark.browardschools.com

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-3	Yes	89%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

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 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.

The mission of Sunland Park Elementary School is to make a difference in the lives of students by providing
learning experiences and opportunities for them to achieve high levels of academic performance. Through
fostering positive growth in social, emotional, and work behaviors, students will be able to learn the necessary
skills to become successful adults in the workplace

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sunland Park Academy's vision is to provide a quality prescriptive social and academic education so that all students are able to reach their full potential within a caring, secure environment.

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
Ragin, Nikia	Principal	Provide instructional vision for all educational programs to increase student achievement as well as progress monitor the growth and success of all students.
Kassim, Helen	Assistant Principal	Assist in providing instructional vision for all educational programs for increasing student achievement as well as progress monitoring the growth and success of all students.
Tibble, Cara	Teacher, PreK	Provide coaching opportunities and assist with curriculum development for teachers assigned to their departments/teams.
Davis, Nicole	Reading Coach	Provide coaching opportunities and assist with curriculum development for teachers assigned to their departments/teams.
Bennett, Raymond	Teacher, K-12	Provide coaching opportunities and assist with curriculum development for teachers assigned to their departments/teams.
Watson, Josephine	Teacher, K-12	Provide coaching opportunities and assist with curriculum development for teachers assigned to their departments/teams.
Alouidor, Alexandra	Teacher, ESE	Sustains or improves students achievement by developing IEPs and by promoting a culture of learning to include all stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/21/2021, Nikia Ragin

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.*

24

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

398

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	92	87	63	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	59	56	34	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
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	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	6	14	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	6	11	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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

Tuesday 9/28/2021

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				54%	59%	57%	52%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					60%	58%	50%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					54%	53%		51%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	65%	63%	61%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains					66%	62%	67%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	51%		47%	47%
Science Achievement					46%	53%		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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	65%	9%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

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

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

To progress monitor student achievement, we utilized the iReady checkpoint 1, checkpoint 2 and checkpoint 3 diagnostics for English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/34%	20/28%	24/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/34%	18/28%	21/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/22%	14/20%	18/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/21%	12/19%	16/23%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	2/50%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	1/50%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	13/25%	11/20%	14/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/24%	11/22%	14/30%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/14%	0	0
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	6/12%	7/13%	15/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/12%	7/15%	14/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	18/27%	25/36%	42/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/28%	23/36%	39/59%
	Students With Disabilities	4/31%	4/31%	5/39%
	English Language Learners	1/10%	2/18%	5/46%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	4/6%	7/10%	20/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	7/11%	20/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	0	2/17%
	English Language Learners	0	0	2/18%

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	38			25							
ELL	33			20							
BLK	41			33							

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
FRL	42			35							
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
ELL											
BLK	55			72							
FRL	55			75							
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
BLK	51	50		59	67						
FRL	51	50		62	67						

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	93
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	89%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	25
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	32
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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?

The data shows an increase in Math achievement and a slight increase in ELA achievement. The data also shows that Sunland Park Academy performed high in Math and performed relative the same in ELA in comparison to that of the district and the state achievement percentages.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment, the data components revealed ELA achievement to be the greatest need for improvement. The ELA achievement was a 52% in 2018 and increase 2% in 2019. With a slight increase in ELA achievement there is a need to continue this improvement.

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

The contributing factors that contributed to the needs of improvement in ELA were the instructional ability to align ELA lesson and activities to grade level standards, strategically addressing learning gaps through remediation and the ability to make data driven decision. Providing standards-based data driven instruction will need to take place to address this need for improvement.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment, the data components revealed Math achievement to have shown the most improvement. The Math achievement increased from a 61% in 2018 to a 73% in 2019. This increase of 12% showed a great improvement in Math.

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

The contributing factors that contributed to the needs of improvement in Math were the instructional ability to provide small group remediation and enrichment and differentiated lessons and activities. Providing the students with mathematical fluency components is an area we incorporated to continue this increase in improvement.

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

To accelerate learning some strategies that will need to be implemented are common formative assessments as well as providing teachers will professional learning focused on standards-based data driven instruction and standards based differentiated instruction and assignments.

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.

Teacher and leaders will engage in on-going professional development focused on the data needs of the students as well as ongoing data chats to conduct data driven decision and instruction.

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

Services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability or improvement in the next year and beyond are:
1. Standards-based quality Tier 1 instructions
2. Standards-based differentiated instructions
3. Remediation, enrichment and fluency lessons and activities
4. ELO camps
5. Parental and community involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The results from the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) revealed that 60% of our 3rd grade students scored below a level 3 on the statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, we will increase student proficiency in ELA from 40% to 50%.
Monitoring:	To progress monitor student achievement, we will utilize the iReady checkpoint 1, checkpoint 2 and checkpoint 3 diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikia Ragin (nikia.ragin@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve the academic performance of students, Sunland Park Academy will follow the BEST Blueprint by provide school level assessments for continual data collection, use the CARE cycle to streamline instruction and remediate students, conduct team and administrative data chats, conduct grade level PLCs and use the RtI system to provide appropriate interventions, monitor attendance, identify struggling students and reasons for low performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The BEST Blueprint strategy was selected because provides a strategic approach to addressing our ELA area of focus while also building capacity and supporting our Broward County Public School's system mission and vision of ensure all students are success and college and career ready.

Action Steps to Implement

provide common formative and summative assessment checkpoint 1, checkpoint 2 and checkpoint 3 diagnostics, ongoing data chats, intervention block, response to intervention and instructional scheduling.

Person Responsible	Nicole Davis (nicoledavis@browardschools.com)

#2. Other specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data trends from 2018 and 2019 revealed Students With Disabilities (SWD) are performing lower then their peers thus presenting an area of concern and focus.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, we will increase student proficiency in ELA from 40% to 50% and SWD will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	To progress monitor student achievement, we will utilize the iReady checkpoint 1, checkpoint 2 and checkpoint 3 diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve the academic performance of students, Sunland Park Academy will follow the BEST Blueprint by provide school level assessments for continual data collection, use the CARE cycle to streamline instruction and remediate students, conduct team and administrative data chats, conduct grade level PLCs and use the RtI system to provide appropriate interventions, monitor attendance, identify struggling students and reasons for low performance. Furthermore teachers will receive professional development on Universal Design of Instruction (UDI).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The UDI ensures that all students instructional needs are being meet and the BEST Blueprint strategy was selected because provides a strategic approach to addressing our ELA area of focus while also building capacity and supporting our Broward County Public School's system mission and vision of ensure all students are success and college and career ready.

Action Steps to Implement

Providing opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development focused on best practices when working with SWD.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Alouidor (alexandra.alouidor@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.

Based on the 2019-2020 Florida School Safety dashboard, the discipline data revealed fighting to be Sunland Park Academy a primary area of concern. We will implement a positive behavior plan and will monitor during the upcoming school year.

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.

Sunland Park Academy will implement and utilize strategies to sustain and improve a positive school culture and environment. These strategies include our Character Trait Education, our Social Emotional Learning lesson and programs as well as keeping an open door communication forum with all stakeholders.

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

Sunland Park Academy's stakeholders include students, staff and community members. A representative from each stakeholders are a part of the school's School Advisory Council (SAC) composition. In addition to Sunland Park Academy's SAC we also support our School Advisory Forum (SAF). During our SAC and SAF meetings stakeholders collaborate and discuss strategies to support the vision and mission of the school for promoting a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$15,561.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336	520-Textbooks	0611 - Sunland Park Academy	Title, I Part A		$2,749.00
		Notes: English Language Arts instructional materials				
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0611 - Sunland Park Academy	Title, I Part A		$5,403.00
		Notes: School City K-3rd Licenses				
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0611 - Sunland Park Academy	Title, I Part A		$7,409.00
		Notes: ELO stipends for academic camps in reading and math				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Students with Disabilities				$931.00

Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0611 - Sunland Park Academy	Title, I Part A		$931.00
				Total:	$16,492.00