

Duval County Public Schools

Enterprise Learning Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

<http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise>

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Collins II

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Duval 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

We encourage a positive collaborative community that differentiates instruction and challenges students to do their best.

Provide the school's vision statement

Enterprise Learning Academy provides an engaging environment that empowers students to be compassionate and responsible learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Collins, Jeff	Principal	School Safety Instructional Leader Attendance Intervention Team MTSS Team Local Education Agency Representative Scheduling Campus Supervision Oversee Implementation of Standards-Based Education Teacher Evaluations Data Analysis SAC PTA Budget Public Relations Office Staff Faith-Based Partnerships Business Partners Professional Development
Glover, Candice	Assistant Principal	School Safety Instructional Leader Attendance Intervention Team MTSS Team Local Education Agency Representative Scheduling Campus Supervision Oversee Implementation of Standards-Based Education Teacher Evaluations Data Analysis SAC PTA Budget Public Relations Office Staff Faith-Based Partnerships Business Partners Professional Development
Teper, Hope	Assistant Principal	School Safety Instructional Leader Attendance Intervention Team MTSS Team Local Education Agency Representative Scheduling Campus Supervision Oversee Implementation of Standards-Based Education

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Teacher Evaluations Data Analysis SAC PTA Budget Public Relations Office Staff Faith-Based Partnerships Business Partners Professional Development
Blake, Faylene	Instructional Coach	Coaching Cycles with Teachers Common Planning with Teachers Data Analysis Professional Development

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Jeffrey Collins II

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%

<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)</p>	<p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (39%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Northeast</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>Dustin Sims</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	
<p>Year</p>	
<p>Support Tier</p>	<p>NOT IN DA</p>
<p>ESSA Status</p>	
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	118	134	112	135	124	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	36	42	25	41	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	5	3	6	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	42	89	73	58	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	61	107	72	91	23	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398

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	45	95	67	64	27	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340

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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	50%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	56%	58%	43%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	40%	46%	48%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	56%	62%	63%	56%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	47%	63%	62%	47%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	52%	51%	26%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	40%	48%	53%	47%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	37%	50%	-13%	56%	-19%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	43	63	24	26	26	24				
ELL	8			23	20						
BLK	37	41	48	50	42	38	30				
HSP	43	48	60	51	44	27	33				
MUL	45	42		55	25						
WHT	49	56	47	66	57		55				
FRL	37	47	51	47	41	28	29				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	32	38	29	44	40	15				
ASN	92	70		92	80						
BLK	33	40	39	50	41	19	33				
HSP	47	55		52	48	33	44				
MUL	48	29		52	36						
WHT	50	41	32	60	49	33	50				
FRL	36	40	36	50	45	22	35				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
-----------------------------	--

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math LPQ had 30% learning gains, up just 4% from the previous school year. Contributing factors include the following: lack of monitoring student progress, lack of differentiation to meet needs of LPQ students, teaching not aligned to the standard, etc.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline, a 7% drop from the previous school year. Contributing factors may include the following: lack of monitoring student progress, not teaching to the standard, teachers not implementing science curriculum, etc.

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

The area of math learning gains for the LPQ had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Factors may have included the following: lack of monitoring student progress,

lack of differentiation to meet the needs of LPQ students, not teaching to the standard, etc.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the LPQ for ELA. A reading interventionist worked solely with the LPQ students in grades 3-5.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The number of students who are 1 or more levels behind in Reading.

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

1. Instructional Culture
2. Math LPQ
3. Reading Proficiency
4. Science Proficiency
5. Reading and Math Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on administration classroom walkthroughs, only 50% (0.5 of 1.0 scale) of classrooms observed adequately assessed student learning. The data suggests that students are not being afforded opportunities to demonstrate whether they have truly mastered the standard/content.

Measureable Outcome: 100% of our current core content teachers will successfully engage in common planning by using learning arc process to prepare common aligned assessments to determine student mastery.

Under the Assessing of Student Learning dashboard, improve “Determines Mastery” dial from 0.5 to 0.7 for 20-21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Faylene Blake (blakef@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Planning for all Enterprise Learning Academy teachers by content and by grade level
 During common planning, teachers will utilize learning arcs to increase content knowledge and use of Understanding by Design by beginning with the end in mind
 Teachers will plan exit tickets and other assessments that are aligned to the Florida Standards and Achievement Level Descriptors
 Teachers will discuss student results to determine student mastery and plan next steps

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on a review of last year’s SWT dashboard and evidence presented it was determined that we needed to improve the alignment of assessing student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will revisit Standards Walkthrough Tool and calibrate in order to promote alignment

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Develop master schedule that affords opportunities for teachers to engage in weekly common planning sessions

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Provide tiered professional development on Understanding by Design framework and review of Learning Arc process

Person Responsible Faylene Blake (blakef@duvalschools.org)

During administrative-led common planning sessions with content specific grade bands, Enterprise Learning Academy teachers will complete learning arcs on specific standards

Person Responsible Faylene Blake (blakef@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will use the learning arc to develop common assessments and exit tickets that are aligned to the Florida Standards and Achievement Level Descriptors

Person Responsible Hope Teper (smithh1@duvalschools.org)

Administration will complete Standards Walkthrough Tool and meet weekly to discuss progress and determine next steps

Person Responsible Candice Glover (gloverc@duvalschools.org)

Principal will meet monthly with region leadership to calibrate and receive feedback for actionable next steps

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Principal will meet monthly with partner principal to calibrate and receive feedback for actionable next steps

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will complete deep data dives when analyzing student assessments so they can adequately plan, make instructional decisions, and plan next steps for students

Person Responsible Hope Teper (smithh1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 5 Essentials Survey Data, teachers rated the area of Collective Responsibility as very weak (19%). Specifically, only 23% of the teachers at ELA feel responsible when students fail. This area directly impacts student development, school improvement, and professional growth and this was one of our weakest areas.

Measureable Outcome: Future 5 Essentials Survey
Mini assessments to identify student deficits and areas to address deficits from prior grades that prevent students from mastering current grade level content
Baseline data (i-Ready)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Participation in vertical articulation among grade levels
Vertical articulation to work together to develop the mini assessments
Include interventionists with common planning
Include interventionists with grade level PLC(s)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need to quickly identify areas of student deficiencies and address accordingly
Based on 5 Essentials Survey, they did not have collective responsibility from one grade level to the next

Action Steps to Implement

Provide strategic and intentional opportunities throughout the school year for teachers to engage in vertical articulation across grade levels and content areas

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Instructional coach will work with teachers to examine standards, learning arcs, and how standards build on each other from one grade level to the next

Person Responsible Faylene Blake (blakef@duvalschools.org)

Vertical teams will identify specific areas/standards to address student deficiencies and plan next steps

Person Responsible Faylene Blake (blakef@duvalschools.org)

Frequently share data and analyze trends across grade levels and content areas. Add data to weekly newsletter and monthly faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will continue this year right where we left off in the 2019-2020 school year. We will utilize Corrective Reading to address students who are 1 or more years behind in the area of Reading. In addition, LPQ Reading students will work specifically with a Reading Interventionist. Our LPQ Math students will work with a Math Interventionist. We will continue to build the foundation of our instructional culture and improve teacher trust and relationships among each other. In the area of Science proficiency, we will continue to use instruction that is aligned to the standard, develop common assessments and exit tickets to assess student mastery of the standard and then develop/plan next steps.

Para professionals will be utilized to assist with small group instruction to improve student achievement. Our parent liaison will be utilized to leverage and increase parent engagement which in turn will promote student achievement. The additional technology such as document cameras, projectors, and/or interactive monitors will be used to increase student engagement and positively effect student achievement. Site licenses for Reflex Math and Study Island will provide additional supplemental opportunities for our students to advance learning and student achievement.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our approach to build and sustain a positive school culture is multi-faceted. We begin by listening to all stakeholders and setting up a framework whereby they can share in a non-threatening manner. We set up meetings with stakeholder groups and documented their input. Next, we built a plan to address these perceived areas of opportunity. In addition, we devised a school improvement plan that embodied their input. This information was then circulated and shared with all groups and continuously revisited via faculty meetings, parent nights, school advisory council, etc.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00