Martin County School District

Citrus Grove Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Citrus Grove Elementary

2527 SW CITRUS BLVD, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/cges

Demographics

Principal: Darcia Borel

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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 Martin 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

Citrus Grove Elementary

2527 SW CITRUS BLVD, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/cges

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	No	20%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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 Citrus Grove Elementary is to provide opportunities for students to achieve their personal best and become responsible, healthy, and productive citizens who embrace lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cultivating Generations of Excellence

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
Rynca, Rose	Assistant Principal	
Morrow, Todd	Principal	
Windsor, Sharon	Instructional Media	
Tuma, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Bookall, Rennay	School Counselor	
Reinhart, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/1/2016, Darcia Borel

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

Total number of students enrolled at the school
588

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

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	86	114	102	97	101	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	16	10	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/20/2021

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	76	103	92	83	90	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	9	6	13	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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	76	103	92	83	90	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	9	6	13	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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				72%	58%	57%	74%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	59%	58%	59%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	56%	53%	40%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	65%	63%	77%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	65%	62%	68%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	53%	51%	54%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	58%	53%	62%	59%	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	74%	54%	20%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	55%	18%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	58%	11%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	74%	67%	7%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	53%	18%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade level progress monitoring was conducted using I Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic assessments, Science data collected by District PMT testing.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	67	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	56	77
	Students With Disabilities	39	53	74
	English Language Learners	25	50	61
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	51	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	41	63
	Students With Disabilities	32	45	65
	English Language Learners	12	25	70

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	67	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	56	75
	Students With Disabilities	41	50	67
	English Language Learners	28	56	59
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	50	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	38	59
	Students With Disabilities	33	44	60
	English Language Learners	11	28	59

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	65	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	54	62
	Students With Disabilities	28	36	41
	English Language Learners	22	50	56
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	46	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	32	55
	Students With Disabilities	17	22	41
	English Language Learners	11	28	56

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	68	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	60	65
	Students With Disabilities	38	45	49
	English Language Learners	29	59	69
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	50	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	35	62
	Students With Disabilities	25	29	43
	English Language Learners	12	41	75

Grade 5			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	64	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	60	62
	Students With Disabilities	30	30	35
	English Language Learners	27	53	57
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	52	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	40	69
	Students With Disabilities	15	15	25
	English Language Learners	13	15	25
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	33	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	21	15
	Students With Disabilities	14	13	14
	English Language Learners	20	40	20

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	28			24							
ELL	53			53							
HSP	61	62		58	62		54				
WHT	70	70	65	72	62	52	64				
FRL	53	71		51	59		64				

				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	47	32	25	44	57	45					
ELL	61	70		56	75						
HSP	73	67		62	59	36	67				
WHT	72	54	51	75	68	58	68				
FRL	59	45	40	61	58	50	63				

				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	43	50	38	58	67	71	28				
ELL	64	55		64	64						
HSP	69	78	50	76	78		71				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	75	55	37	77	65	56	62				
FRL	52	48	33	65	65		41				

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	65
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
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	60
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?

Grade level data shows consistent increase of achievement from first progress monitoring assessments. The one exception would be in the area of grade 5 Science.

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

The area of significant change in performance was Science dropping 8 points.
(2021 63 % proficient, 2019 70% proficient, 2018 62 % proficient)

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

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

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

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

Hands on lesson/labs addressing assessed standards more frequently.

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:	

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide opportunities for instructional ELA staff to collaborate on the curriculum and understand reports to interpret data in order to increase fidelity of implementation of Benchmark Advance across campus.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA FSA Achievement scores by 5% over previous year.
Monitoring:	CLTeams will review data routinely after each administration of progress monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective Teacher Efficacy
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that using a standards aligned curriculum with a focus on grade level text can result in higher achievement levels for learners.
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase MATH FSA Achievement scores by 5% over previous year.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	68 percent of students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2022 Grade 5 Science Assessment.
Monitoring:	Teachers will work collaboratively in CLTs to monitor student progress. The data will be used to plan instruction, remediate and enrich.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective Teacher Efficacy -
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers working together to develop a positive growth mindset to address the learner's potential.

Action Steps to Implement

Science Lab teacher will provide conduct hands- on Science lessons.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

Science Lab teacher will provide classroom teachers guidance during CLT meetings routinely regarding tested standards instruction and crosswalk of Benchmark advanced/Science Crosswalk.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Learning teams will review/analyze progress monitoring results and address area of need form these results.

Person Responsible	Rose Rynca (ryncar@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Student Engagement Survey 3-5 2021-2022 shows decrease in "disagree" by 2%
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Teacher Engagement Survey 2021-2022 shows decrease in "disagree" by 2% for rationale statements compared to previous year survey based on strategies implemented.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00