Bradford High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bradford High School

581 N TEMPLE AVE, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bhs

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Coffey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	87%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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 Bradford 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

Bradford High School

581 N TEMPLE AVE, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bhs

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)
High School 9-12	No	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bradford 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 Bradford High School is to provide our students with an environment that challenges all students academically to empower them to become life-long learners in a very diverse global community. To this end, we will provide a safe environment for all students emotionally and socially, while instilling pride, respect, and responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to build strong, positive relationships through rigorous academic opportunities for all scholars. We will ensure all stakeholders hold themselves to a higher standard in order to ensure a sense of pride and community in our school.

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
Ward, Angela	Principal	Instructional leader that ensures the daily operations of the school are met.
Coffey , Christopher	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader that ensures the daily operations of the school are met.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Christopher Coffey

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
766

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
12

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	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	23	23	30	17	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	47	36	27	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	39	36	9	106
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	58	35	6	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	49	46	32	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	36	35	25	123
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	49	46	32	173

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	45	70	52	21	188

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	6	23	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	10	21

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 10/14/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	157	141	126	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	120	113	96	441
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	12	3	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	24	9	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	34	7	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	40	44	24	152
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	35	20	117

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	48	57	66	37	208

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	4	0	12	11	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	21

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	154	157	141	126	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	120	113	96	441
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	12	3	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	24	9	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	34	7	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	40	44	24	152
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	35	20	117

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	48	57	66	37	208

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	4	0	12	11	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	21

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				39%	39%	56%	44%	44%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	48%	51%	62%	62%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	47%	42%	53%	53%	44%
Math Achievement				48%	48%	51%	31%	31%	51%
Math Learning Gains				67%	67%	48%	53%	53%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	45%	61%	61%	45%
Science Achievement				62%	62%	68%	51%	51%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	73%	73%	57%	57%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	37%	37%	0%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	37%	37%	0%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	61%	0%	67%	-6%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	71%	0%	70%	1%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	55%	-17%	61%	-23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	50%	51%	-1%	57%	-7%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR, HMH, IXL, USA Test Prep, School City, Lexia

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50		
	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	8	22	17	21	20	7	22	64		74	31
BLK	22	36	44	11	17	27	41	58		90	45
MUL	30	20									
WHT	45	48	31	42	31	13	69	85		89	62
FRL	30	31	24	24	21	27	55	82		89	49

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	18	38	39	16			28	55		87	19
BLK	17	47	52	21	50		21	56		90	39
HSP	40	36									
MUL	50	60									
WHT	44	49	46	57	71	55	72	75		91	47
FRL	31	45	51	43	61	58	49	68		89	43
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	23	50	41	19			43	41		70	20
BLK	26	53	55	25			38	35		76	31
HSP	58	75									
MUL	64										
WHT	48	64	51	33	55	64	54	65		82	51
FRL	38	59	50	29	49		47	54		78	38

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	87%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	39
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	17
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	43
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?

Across all grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas we are seeing a consistency of students who have a significant gap in their learning. Some to the point of being 2 or more years behind their peers in the same grade level.

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

Math! Our math scores took the biggest hit and still are the most concerning based off our beginning data collected through IXL.
Our current data from state assessments: Overall Math Ach. was down 13%, Math Learning Gains down 39%, and Math Learning Gains Lowest Quartile down 36%. We were significantly lower than the state average.

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

One of the contributing factors was the break in time due to pandemic and when students were accessed on courses. One way we are addressing this need is our schedules are double blocked for math. 75% of our students have both Alg. 1 and LAM on their schedules to reinforce the skills.

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

Social Studies, our overall scores increased by 9% from the previous year.

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

Correctly matched teachers to content. Multiple teachers teaching courses to allow for collaboration and cohesive planning.

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

Lessons that are created with purpose, model thinking, guided practice, collaboration and independent work.

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.

Weekly PLCs with built in structures to support teachers in order to produce high quality instruction. In addition, student talks and engagement pieces will be interwoven to help increase the motivation and participation of students in all content areas.

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

Ongoing PD and walk throughs where meaningful feedback will be provide to help support teachers to master their craft.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The need for scheduled walkthroughs was an area that BHS needed in order to support teachers and to identify areas that could use additional professional development. These will also be used to ensure that standards are being taught and mastered.
Measurable Outcome:	Each day administration will walk 3-4 classrooms to collect data in the areas of: model thinking, guided instruction, collaboration, and independent work. The expectation is that teachers will facilitate the learning in such a way that students derive the answers from their own thinking instead of being told.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by walks that are scheduled and weekly administration and instructional coaches will meet to discuss areas of growth and opportunities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ward (ward.angela@mybradford.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to
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.

Our discipline ranked us extremely high in comparison with other high schools in the state. BHS reported 6.8 incidents per 100 students. The rate is greater than the statewide high school rate of 3.3 incidents per 100 students.
This year we spent a lot of time in the beginning of the year establishing relationships among teachers/students so that students felt welcomed in classrooms. Each 9 weeks we are revisiting with teachers the discipline incidents and discussing ways we can improve practices to help eliminate behaviors that cause disruptions.

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.

For teachers:
Weekly newsletter that highlights positives seen during admin/coach walks.
Monthly birthday celebrations.
Teacher of the month beginning in October. This teacher will be spotlighted through social media etc.

For students:
Academic and sports recognition.
Student of the month beginning in October. This student will be spotlighted through social media etc.
Attendance goals.
Weekly social and emotional activities.
Faculty taking the time to build the relationships so that students feel safe to be on campus.

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

Angela Ward ~ Principal
Chris Coffey ~ Asst. Principal
Jason Dupree ~ Virtual Admin/Assessments
David Duncan ~ BRT
Sampson Jackson ~ Athletic Director
Renee Cassels ~ Lead Guidance
Chris Chaplin ~ Literacy Coach
Katrina Griffis ~ Principal Secretary
Kim Grimes ~ Bookkeeper
Shelley Rodgers ~ Data Entry Clerk

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice:**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**