

Putnam County School District

The Children's Reading Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	16
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	17

The Children's Reading Center

7901 SAINT JOHNS AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/crccs

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Our school mission is that all adults work together to promote high levels of learning for all students in a caring, respectful, and disciplined environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that all children learn to their highest potential in a caring, disciplined environment that has high expectations for all children, in order for them to become productive citizens of our society.

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
England, Jacqueline	Principal	My duties include leadership for the entire school, ESE coordinator, curriculum and instruction.

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.

Each year we meet with our stakeholders (school employees, parents, and school leadership team, and our board members). We discuss the results of our parent survey and determine what we should include in our school improvement plan.

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))

The SIP will be visited several times through the year to guarantee we are making improvements to our goals. Goals will be revised as necessary.

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)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
Charter School	Yes
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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	4	12	12	9	8	8	4	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	5	2	4	2	4	1	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	3	1	0	1	1	6	3	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	6	3	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	4	7	3	0	0	23

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	1	1	2	1	1	3	3	0	0	12

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	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
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		7	8	8	2	4	5	8	0	0	42
One or more suspensions		0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA		1	3	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	11
Course failure in Math		1	2	0	2	2	2	4	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		4	6	4	9	2	3	1	0	0	29

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	1	3	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	7	8	8	2	4	5	8	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	3	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	2	2	2	4	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	6	4	9	2	3	1	0	0	29

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	1	3	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	76	43	53	75	43	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				77			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				83					
Math Achievement*	86	49	59	85	47	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				83			81		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	90	45	54	82	45	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		56	59						

* 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	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	59			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	66			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	80			

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	81			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	78			

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	76			86			90					
SWD	61			56							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61			71							2	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			89			95				4	
FRL	73			84			83				4	

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	75	77	83	85	83	72	82					
SWD	73	90		60	100							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	74		67	63							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	80	83	91	90		91					
FRL	71	82		79	76	70	88					

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	75	56		78	81		66					
SWD												
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			60								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	76		90	90		71					
FRL	78	57		78	79		80					

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
05	2023 - Spring	76%	45%	31%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	44%	31%	58%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	80%	45%	35%	47%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	36%	37%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
03	2023 - Spring	91%	45%	46%	59%	32%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	51%	34%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	90%	46%	44%	55%	35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	90%	42%	48%	51%	39%

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.

Last year our kindergarten children scored low in reading and math on the FAST. Kindergarten teachers attributed this to the new state test being assessed on the computer instead of paper and pencil. We will try to alleviate this trend by teaching children how to answer multiple choice questions on the computer.

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

Last year our kindergarten children scored low in reading and math on the FAST. Kindergarten teachers attributed this to the new state test being assessed on the computer instead of paper and pencil. We will try to alleviate this trend by teaching children how to answer multiple choice questions on the computer.

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 well above the average for all state averages.

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

Our science FCAT showed the most improvement this past year. In the 2021-2022 school year, 82% of our children received a 3 or higher on the science FCAT. In the 2022-2023 school year, 90% of our children scored 3 or higher. We started an extended review in January and did a boot camp for our third grade students.

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

We are concerned that our children are not understanding how to take an assessment on the computer. There is also the possibility that we need to rethink our teaching in kindergarten to increase scores.

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

1. Teach kindergarten children throughout the year to use the computer to answer multiple choice questions.
2. The reading coach will spend increased time in our kindergarten classrooms to increase student knowledge.
3. As a school, we will inform parents of our efforts to incorporate STEAM activities throughout our school day.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Because our kindergarten scores were lower than other grade levels, it is our intention to elevate those scores this year to be comparable with other grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we monitor kindergarten students on computer programs that allow for multiple choice practice. we will have 70% or higher of our kindergarten students pass the FAST assessment in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Children will be monitored on computer programs that allow for multiple choice practice. Also, PM2 will be used to assess the ability to answer multiple choice questions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Monitored kindergarten students on computer programs that allow for multiple choice practice. Also, PM2 will be used to assess the ability to answer multiple choice questions.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: The end of the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. 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.

As our test scores show, we do not have a problem with teacher retention or hire. We employ highly effective teachers which we are able to retain throughout an entire school year and beyond.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will employ full-time, highly qualified teachers 100% of the time throughout the school year.

Monitoring:

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

The principal will know if we are not 100% staffed at all times.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

The principal will know if we are not 100% staffed at all times.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline England (jengland@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The dissemination of this SIP, along with being on our school website, will be done at faculty meetings, leadership team meetings, and board meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We have several parent meetings throughout the year to keep parents informed on their child's education and to build positive relationships. Our school website is: <https://crccs.putnamschools.org/o/crccs>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Based on past scores, we will continue to use our accelerated curriculum to educate our children.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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