James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/jwjohnson

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of James Weldon Johnson College Prep is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At James Weldon Johnson College Prep, we are empowering students to contribute to a global society by fostering a rich academic experience, a gratefulness for history, a heart for community, and an appreciation for a diverse culture.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stuckey, James	Principal	
Brown, Denetra	Assistant Principal	
Franzese, Michael	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Reviewed previous School Improvement Plans with School Leadership Team and with School Advisory Council which includes teachers, staff, parents, students, business, and community leaders. Took feedback and ideas for what should be included.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School Leadership Team will review the SIP every nine weeks and SAC will receive the Mid-Year Stakeholder's update along with an End of Year meeting.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	49	39	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	29	23	64
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	48	31	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	23	34	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	30	85

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	15	18	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	29	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	22	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	14	17	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	11	35

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	15	18	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	29	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	22	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	14	17	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	11	35

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	75	42	49	79	43	50	80		
ELA Learning Gains				64			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			50		
Math Achievement*	75	49	56	79	35	36	76		
Math Learning Gains				65			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			33		
Science Achievement*	81	48	49	80	48	53	82		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	66	68	92	53	58	90		
Middle School Acceleration	83	82	73	82	47	49	85		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		31	40		85	76			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	65			
ELL	85			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	69			
HSP	79			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	90			
FRL	71			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	81			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	61			
HSP	71			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	75			75			81	96	83			
SWD	49			59			60	87	70		5	
ELL	79			89			90		82		4	
AMI												
ASN	85			92			94	100	95		5	
BLK	63			57			68	91	67		5	
HSP	68			77			70	90	89		5	
MUL	86			86			85	100	93		5	
PAC												
WHT	85			86			89	99	89		5	
FRL	67			61			66	93	70		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	79	64	51	79	65	60	80	92	82			
SWD	51	39	37	44	52	41	41	68	47			
ELL	85	67	73	92	76			92				
AMI												
ASN	94	75	73	95	80	82	93	95	97			
BLK	66	56	45	64	54	54	65	85	64			
HSP	69	59	50	76	62	70	86	94	75			
MUL	95	75		91	79	73	85	100	89			
PAC												
WHT	84	67	55	87	69	61	88	96	91			
FRL	67	54	41	67	58	54	70	82	72			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	80	64	50	76	38	33	82	90	85			
SWD	55	55	46	55	37	26	50	50	64			
ELL	78	82	77	78	55							
AMI												
ASN	94	78	73	95	60	54	98	96	99			
BLK	67	56	41	58	24	26	60	83	65			
HSP	78	65	57	71	27	31	92	88	86			
MUL	93	67		81	37		91	93	95			
PAC												
WHT	87	67	60	86	44	51	89	95	92			
FRL	68	60	50	57	23	25	66	90	69			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2023 - Spring	76%	40%	36%	47%	29%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	41%	32%	47%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	38%	36%	47%	27%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2023 - Spring	73%	43%	30%	54%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	45%	32%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	73%	35%	38%	44%	29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	52%	27%	50%	29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	52%	45%	48%	49%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	64%	36%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	63%	33%	66%	30%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Achievement - we began the year with a vacancy, then had a teacher for 6 weeks who left, then had the vacancy again, then had a teacher who came for 2 months and decided to go to graduate school. Our AP over ELA left in November for a position outside the district.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA Achievement - we began the year with a vacancy, then had a teacher for 6 weeks who left, then had the vacancy again, then had a teacher who came for 2 months and decided to go to graduate school. Our AP over ELA left in November for a position outside the district.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We are above the state average in all areas.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Civics - focused work on standards and student by students benchmark review.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance
ELA

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

ELA
Student Safety

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Positive Culture and Environment area is Student Safety. It was identified through the University of Chicago 5 Essentials Survey that is taken yearly by our faculty, students, and families. It was an area that dropped year over year from 21-22 to 22-23.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We would like to improve the student safety score from the 5 Essentials Survey from 23 to 33.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be polled quarterly through Health courses about areas on campus where the school can improve the safety of students. Ms. Kellow, our School Counselor, will push-in to 6th grade transition and 7th grade and 8th grade Health courses to teach safety lessons for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will be polled quarterly through Health courses about areas on campus where the school can improve the safety of students. Ms. Kellow, our School Counselor, will push-in to 6th grade transition and 7th grade and 8th grade Health courses to teach safety lessons for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will allow the school to review the feelings and experiences of students multiple times throughout the year to determine if we should move the location or support of adults on campus.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teaching student safety expectations along with Dean Washington in a whole group grade level assembly.

Person Responsible: Michael Franzese (franzesem@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 1

Reinforce student safety expectations with Ms. Kellow through Guidance lessons in classes.

Person Responsible: Denetra Brown (brownd10@duvalschools.org)

By When: December 1

Quarterly surveys of student safety concerns in Health courses.

Person Responsible: James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 1

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing ELA Proficiency

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our measurable outcome is to ensure that our ELA Proficiency increases from 74 to 78.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student Data Tracking Sheet with students and accessible and understood, Small Group planning (in lesson plan) and implementation (in walkthroughs)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small groups instruction based on specific benchmarks, Student Ownership - data tracking by benchmark, Exact Path tracking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers are able to provide direct benchmark support to students they will see an increase in their ability to perform at grade level or above on state assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will have a Data Tracking Sheet that they can access and understand

Person Responsible: James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: October 1

Teachers will use data to plan for Small Groups and it will be found in their lesson plan and implemented as evidence in walkthroughs

Person Responsible: James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: October 1

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No