The One Room School House Project

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The One Room School House Project

4180 NE 15TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

http://www.orsh.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Sonberg

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	Black/African American Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua 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

The One Room School House Project

4180 NE 15TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

http://www.orsh.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)
Elementary School KG-6	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	Yes	74%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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 The One Room School House is to extend the opportunity for school choice to at risk Alachua County school students who may not otherwise have a chance to participate in a small, highly rigorous, family oriented, and academically intensive educational experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of The One Room School House is to offer the opportunity to at risk Alachua County school students to participate in a small, highly rigorous, family oriented, and academically intensive educational experience.

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
Mosley, Sarah	Principal	Overall supervision and planning for all aspects of school functions.
Minsavage, Jeanne	Assistant Principal	Testing Coordination

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 2/1/2017, Sarah Sonberg

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
12

Total number of students enrolled at the school
187

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

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	46	30	29	34	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
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	6	2	2	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	1	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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
Thursday 9/30/2021

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	30	28	34	26	30	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	30	28	34	26	30	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				63%	59%	57%	63%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	57%	58%	60%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	49%	53%	67%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	60%	63%	56%	64%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	61%	62%	40%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	49%	51%	33%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	57%	53%	33%	55%	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%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	62%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	60%	-23%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	53%	-7%
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 school uses iStation as their progress monitoring tool where students are assessed with Math and Reading ISIPs monthly. The school also uses benchmark assessments from the current curriculums. The school is 99.4% Economically Disadvantaged and 74.7% students with disabilities.

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	48%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51%	57%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	35%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	15%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	55%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	10%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	63%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	14%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46%	57%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	19%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45%	50%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	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
BLK	38	60		44	60						
WHT	64			64							
FRL	41			38							

| 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	59	60	80	43	54	70	36				
WHT	80	69		55	69						
FRL	52	55	80	43	53	73	39				

| 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	52	50		52	31						
WHT	76	69		62	44						
FRL	61	59	73	54	43	36	33				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

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

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

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

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
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	40
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?

There was a significant decrease in ELA achievement across all grade levels.

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

The greatest need for improvement would be in ELA achievement specifically in 3rd grade, now 4th grade students. Although ELA achievement decreased to 45%, the students still had 59% ELA gains.

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 for the decrease in achievement would be the high flex classrooms last year. They put strain on teachers, students, parents and staff. High flex classrooms did not work well for our elementary age students that are not working fully independently.

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

Math achievement and gains in 4th and 5th grades increased. Math learning gains overall was a 76%. Grade 5 had 50% achievement in science which was 5% over the district average and 3% higher then the state average.

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

Math has been a struggle for our students in years past. We put more focus on math creating longer math blocks to help combat the COVID learning loss.

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

The school has brought back all students on campus. We have increased our intervention teachers from 1 to 3.

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.

All teachers and staff have access to the district's professional development platform. The school encourages all teachers and staff to check the platform frequently and register for learning opportunities that will be beneficial to their teaching, their students and their classrooms.

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

The school has increased data chats with the intervention teachers. Additional data progress monitoring software programs have been purchased.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA was our lowest area of achievement therefore the school feels that this subject requires the most attention and change in strategy for the new school year.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement on this year's FSA of at least 50%,
Monitoring:	ISIPs will be monitored for gains in ELA for all students. Any students not making gains will be pulled by an intervention teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Mosley (s.mosley@orsh.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school has increased the amount of intervention teachers from 1 to 3. A new ELA curriculum has been adopted.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing intervention teachers create more opportunity for more students to receive intervention. Adopting a new curriculum keeps students working on current state approved standards in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

-Create schedules to allow the most opportunities for students to receive pull out intervention.
-Buying, distributing and training teachers on the new ELA curriculum

Person Responsible	Sarah Mosley (s.mosley@orsh.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although Math had an increase, the school would like to continue improving student achievement in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	Math achievement on this year's FSA of at least 50%,
Monitoring:	ISIPs will be monitored for gains in Math for all students. Any students not making gains will be pulled by an intervention teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Mosley (s.mosley@orsh.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school has increased the amount of intervention teachers from 1 to 3. Math blocks have been increased.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing intervention teachers create more opportunity for more students to receive intervention. Extending daily math blocks allows classroom teachers to have more time teaching and practicing each state approved standards in Math.

Action Steps to Implement

-Make changes to schedule
-Create schedules to allow the most opportunities for students to receive pull out intervention.

Person Responsible	Sarah Mosley (s.mosley@orsh.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.

There is no data listed on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website for the school. Discipline is currently not an area of concern. However, discipline is highly monitored and there are mental health and threat assessment teams in place in the event that a concern arises.

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.

Teachers and staff will have trainings in youth mental health and maintain any ongoing training to stay current. We have a social worker on campus every week to help assist with any mental health needs needs that may arise with students, staff and teachers. The school's occupational therapist that comes 2-3 times per week also trains staff and work with students with social-emotional needs.

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

The school's stakeholders include our parents, teachers, staff and students. We have ongoing communication with stakeholders for input and feedback pertaining to 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: ELA				$92,157.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$56,527.80
			Notes: Salary for ELA Intervention Teachers			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$1,761.15
			Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$30,978.25
			Notes: Push in Paraprofessional			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$2,890.00
			Notes: Purchase of Freckle - an ELA program for Kindergarten through 5th grade that helps prepare students on the state standards.			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$59,417.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$56,527.80
			Notes: Salaries for math intervention teachers			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0950 - The One Room School House Project	Title, I Part A		$2,890.00
			Notes: Purchase of Freckle - a Math program for Kindergarten through 5th grade that helps prepare students on the state standards.			
					Total:	$151,575.00