

Polk County Public Schools

Sleepy Hill Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Sleepy Hill Middle School

2215 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/shms>

Demographics

Principal: Wallace Selph

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Polk 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

Our mission is to create a learning community with a safe and orderly, caring and supportive environment. We will eliminate barriers of achievement and create endless possibilities for success. Learning For All: Whatever It Takes!

Provide the school's vision statement

Students will acquire the education and skills necessary to become contributing members of society.

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
Selph, Wallace	Principal	
Kowallek, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Hearns, Dolecia	Assistant Principal	
Bookhamer, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

wren, maegan

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Wallace Selph

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	316	291	0	0	0	0	1051
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	107	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	169	0	0	0	0	282
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	88	100	0	0	0	0	317
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	99	90	0	0	0	0	307

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	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	26	51	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	56	95	0	0	0	0	187
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	128	213	0	0	0	0	466

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	25	17	39	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	9

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	57	26	51	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	56	95	0	0	0	0	187
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	128	213	0	0	0	0	466

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	25	17	39	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	9

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	41%	48%	54%	35%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	52%	54%	43%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	47%	35%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	37%	50%	58%	32%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	41%	50%	57%	39%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	51%	46%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	44%	51%	43%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	72%	72%	72%	95%	86%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	37%	48%	-11%	54%	-17%
	2018	30%	41%	-11%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	42%	-11%	52%	-21%
	2018	32%	42%	-10%	51%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
	2018	41%	49%	-8%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	47%	-10%	55%	-18%
	2018	29%	40%	-11%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	25%	39%	-14%	54%	-29%
	2018	20%	40%	-20%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	13%	35%	-22%	46%	-33%
	2018	16%	34%	-18%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	40%	41%	-1%	48%	-8%
	2018	40%	42%	-2%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	70%	-1%	71%	-2%
2018	95%	84%	11%	71%	24%
Compare		-26%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	50%	38%	61%	27%
2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Compare		12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	53%	33%	57%	29%
2018	89%	41%	48%	56%	33%
Compare		-3%			

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	20	41	38	22	38	38	22	48	18		
ELL	18	42	43	24	35	40	21	49	24		

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
ASN	86	93		86	64				70		
BLK	29	46	42	21	34	36	37	75	40		
HSP	40	50	44	36	42	44	34	65	48		
MUL	42	44		44	47		57	64			
WHT	50	55	46	50	43	49	59	79	70		
FRL	35	47	45	34	38	41	36	70	51		

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	10	28	29	14	41	45	18				
ELL	15	31	33	19	34	40	13				
ASN	71	71		86	86						
BLK	24	38	36	22	36	42	27	85	70		
HSP	33	40	31	28	36	47	40	100	68		
MUL	47	52		32	34				77		
WHT	48	50	44	47	45	51	59	96	69		
FRL	32	41	36	29	37	45	38	93	71		

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	47
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	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
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	56
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

ELL student achievement in ELA and Math data school wide. Students did not consistent support for the data provided. Efforts were made to get accurate information on student placement in 19-20.

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

Lowest 25% learning gains and SWD for black students in math . Our students were not provided targeted differentiated support. Additionally, school wide our students did not have consistent support.

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

7th and 8th grade Math proficiency. Student did not have consistent math instruction and limited access to intensive math options.

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

SWD and ELL learning gains in ELA. recognizing the need for student support, the ELL students were included in targeted differentiated support with the students in the bottom 25. Students in these groups were targeted for after school tutoring to provide skills based instruction based on standards needing more emphasis and understanding. These students also received small group instruction in the classroom and were also provided additional support by the reading coach. Student data was consistently monitored and discussed.

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

Attendance and discipline (suspensions).

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

1. Bottom 25% learning gains
2. ELL student Achievement

- 3. Students with Disabilities
- 4. Discipline
- 5. Incoming 6th grade students - academic gaps/new environment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Black/African American students performed the second lowest in Math in all three categories. Math Achievement 21%. Math Learning gains 34% and Math Learning Gains for bottom quartile 36%.
Measureable Outcome:	Math proficiency will increase to 26% . Students will be identified through the MTSS process and will use the data to allocate resources to obtain student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR and monitored through the MTSS process. Additionally, they will be provided small group instruction from the Math Interventionist and Math Coach.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data on Black/African American students and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures.

Action Steps to Implement

1. STAR data and Module assessments will be used to ensure proper students are in intensive math classes, monitor student progress and to drive differentiated instruction. Computer lab para will aid in creating an effective testing environment.
2. Math coach will oversee tutoring before and after school to address skill deficits
3. Math Interventionist/ resource staff will provide small group instruction to the bubble students within this group on deficit skills identified from STAR and/or module assessment two times a week. After instruction, Math buddies will be assigned to provide peer support to aid in understanding and completing practice problems.
4. The behavior interventionist will assist in identification of Math buddies and monitor the peer to peer remediation sessions. Students will be selected based on FSA, progress monitoring data and ability to work with others. Once identified the students will meet for an additional 10 minutes after each small group.

Person Responsible Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data represents an increase in ELA achievement for ELL students with overall proficiency at only 18 percent. Students will need continued targeted support in order to increase learning gains and achieve proficiency. Math achievement overall increased 5%, however learning gains increased only 1% and the bottom 25% learning gains remained the same. Students will need targeted support in math.

Measurable Outcome: English Language Learners will increase proficiency to 21% and increase learning gains in both ELA and Math to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Bookhamer (jennifer.bookhamer@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be identified through initial test scores, Access for ELL's and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data on English Language Learners and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student's will be identified based on their current proficiency levels and strategically scheduled for support in academic instruction as well as for peer support.
2. Student will receive support in utilizing content specific dictionaries within the content area classroom to assist with content specific support.
3. Instructional coaches will assist in monitoring peer to peer support practices, specifically looking to pair an exited ELL student with a NES/LES.
4. LF follow up plans will be structured and monitored for continued academic achievement.
5. Science coach will support the use of content glossaries in the Science curriculum to assist ELL students in the Science classroom.
6. Students will also have access to new library books in the media center.
7. Extended Learning special activities or field trips will be offered to increase learning opportunities for students and a poster printer will be used to help create a positive learning culture.

Person Responsible Jennifer Bookhamer (jennifer.bookhamer@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our student with disabilities performed the lowest in Math in both learning gains categories; Math Learning gains 41% and Math Learning Gains for bottom quartile 38%.

Measureable Outcome: LG 45% bottom quartile 50%
Learning gains in Math will increase to 45% and the Math Learning Gains for bottom quartile will increase to 42. Students will be identified and MTSS team will use the data to allocate resources to obtain student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Doleciea Hearn (doleciea.hearns@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR and monitored through the MTSS process. Additionally, they will be provided small group instruction from the Math Interventionist and Math Coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data on student with disabilities and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures.

Action Steps to Implement

1. STAR data and Module assessments will be used to strategically schedule students, monitor student progress and drive differentiated instruction. (Computer Lab para will aid in creating an effective testing environment.)
2. Math coach will support teachers to create tasks aligned to the standards that will increase student mastery of standard and create formative assessments to assist teachers in monitoring the student's progress
3. LEA will ensure that teachers are supporting students in classrooms to provide necessary support based on student needs. LEA will institute monthly training to equip teachers with inclusion support strategies. Training will consist of compliance training (writing IEP's, accountability logs) and strategies to directly assist students in the inclusion setting.
4. Student Success Coach will implement Check and Connect with 6 mentor teachers to facilitate one on one mentoring with a select group of 6th and 7th grade students who have high absences and suspensions.

Person Responsible Doleciea Hearn (doleciea.hearns@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership will also focus on building positive relationships with stakeholders and parents through initiatives sponsored by the school. Involvement of the community is pivotal to the success of the students and the school.

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 focus is creating a culture where students, staff, families and stakeholders feel accepted and are helping the students focus on doing their best work. To build a safe and inclusive school community, the leadership team will take the following steps: (1) create grade level teams and appoint chairs to share leadership and support collaborative efforts throughout the school; (2) use the school advisory council to communicate improvement strategies with community stakeholders; (3) implement both academic and festive school functions that result in family and community engagement and support.

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: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00