

St. Johns County School District

Liberty Pines Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Liberty Pines Academy

10901 RUSSELL SAMPSON RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-lpa.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Traci Hemingway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	9%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Liberty Pines Academy

10901 RUSSELL SAMPSON RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-lpa.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>9%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>29%</p>

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Liberty Pines Academy (LPA) will provide a high-quality educational experience by continually building the instructional capacity of our teachers and developing meaningful relationships with our students, staff, and community. Students and staff will implement and use instructional strategies that foster critical thinking and problem solving through real-world learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision at Liberty Pines Academy is to ensure high levels of learning and expectations for all students and staff. Through our continuous collaborative effort, students will have character, knowledge, and skills essential to pursuing their goals and dreams successfully throughout their lives.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hemingway, Traci	Principal	
Haas, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
McCool, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Thompson, Terri	Instructional Coach	
Myers, Jaclyn	SAC Member	
Raya, Staci	Teacher, K-12	
Ryan, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Thomson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Cash, Genell	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Penny	Teacher, K-12	
Ferrara, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
Martin, Alex	Teacher, K-12	
Herkel, Jill	Teacher, K-12	
Crafts, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Robertson, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Veniard, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Glennon, Erin	Assistant Principal	

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	140	160	160	161	165	183	187	219	218	0	0	0	0	1593
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	2	0	2	3	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	1	7	11	7	18	18	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	13	13	24	15	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	3	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	21

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

99

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	6	5	6	7	7	13	14	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	7	3	6	18	15	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	15	13	24	16	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	0	1	1	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	20

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
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	6	5	6	7	7	13	14	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	7	3	6	18	15	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	15	13	24	16	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	0	1	1	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	20

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	79%	84%	61%	80%	72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	67%	59%	63%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	61%	54%	53%	62%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	88%	62%	87%	76%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	71%	59%	72%	65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	66%	52%	65%	68%	52%
Science Achievement	77%	77%	56%	78%	73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	95%	78%	95%	85%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	140 (0)	160 (0)	160 (0)	161 (0)	165 (0)	183 (0)	187 (0)	219 (0)	218 (0)	1593 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (2)	2 (8)	2 (6)	0 (5)	2 (6)	3 (7)	4 (7)	14 (13)	14 (14)	45 (68)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (0)	7 (7)	11 (3)	7 (6)	18 (18)	18 (15)	65 (50)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	0 (3)	5 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	6 (6)	13 (15)	13 (13)	24 (24)	15 (16)	72 (75)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	78%	5%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
	2018	82%	74%	8%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	79%	76%	3%	56%	23%
	2018	74%	73%	1%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	78%	74%	4%	54%	24%
	2018	76%	71%	5%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	72%	72%	0%	52%	20%
	2018	79%	70%	9%	51%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
	2018	84%	76%	8%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	82%	4%	62%	24%
	2018	87%	80%	7%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	82%	7%	64%	25%
	2018	84%	83%	1%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	74%	80%	-6%	60%	14%
	2018	84%	79%	5%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	87%	74%	13%	55%	32%
	2018	75%	73%	2%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
	2018	93%	80%	13%	54%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	90%	78%	12%	46%	44%
	2018	89%	73%	16%	45%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	73%	-5%	53%	15%
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	84%	72%	12%	48%	36%
	2018	84%	75%	9%	50%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	90%	4%	71%	23%
2018	95%	89%	6%	71%	24%
Compare		-1%			
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	97%	79%	18%	61%	36%
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	43	56	55	56	59	51	38	79			
ELL	50	65	56	64	60	47					
ASN	89	70	55	98	86		84	100	79		
BLK	49	49	48	70	56	56	35	90			
HSP	69	61	41	80	63	47	63	93	47		
MUL	81	57	67	83	80	58	75				
WHT	81	69	64	88	75	68	81	95	64		
FRL	57	52	38	74	67	52	51	85	43		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	40	51	38	50	55	44	44	73			
ELL	60	67	71	80	80						
ASN	91	75		97	81		89	95	88		
BLK	60	54	43	68	59	38	65				

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
HSP	76	66	68	84	80	79	69	85	40		
MUL	70	54	50	78	68	50	50				
WHT	81	62	54	88	71	65	81	96	53		
FRL	70	59	60	80	62	55	60	86	63		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	741
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	83
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	72
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	76
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	58
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

Lowest performance is ELA Lowest Quartile. We had a 5% growth in this area and will continue to focus our efforts on identifying student needs and providing interventions during small group and school wide intervention time.

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

Lowest quartile students making learning gains in math is an area of concern. Teachers not providing intentional interventions during math delivered in small group settings.

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 higher than the state in all areas. Collaborative planning and common assessments are contributing factors.

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

ELA Lowest Quartiles showed the most improvement with 5% increase. The use of collaborative planning and analyzing student common summative assessments to plan for targeted interventions is what lead to this increase.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Level 1 on State-Wide Assessments.

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

1. Increase in ELA Lowest 25% by at least 2%.
2. Increase in Math Lowest 25% by at least 2%.
3. Focus on Character Counts and implementing a school-wide PBIS system to address social emotional needs.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Quartile in ELA
Rationale	Only 58% of our lowest quartile in ELA made learning gains.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase learning gains by at least 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Traci Hemingway (traci.hemingway@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC team minutes, teacher lesson plans, FSA data, common assessment data, iReady data, and teacher observation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PLC team minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and iReady data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with PLC team for data chats 2. Provide teacher observation feedback 3. Progress monitoring of L25 using iReady and common assessment data 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Traci Hemingway (traci.hemingway@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile in Math
Rationale	Only 64% of students made learning gains in the lowest quartile in math.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase learning gains by at least 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Traci Hemingway (traci.hemingway@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC team minutes, teacher lesson plans, FSA data, common assessment data, iReady data, and teacher observation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PLC team minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and iReady data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with PLC team for data chats 2. Provide teacher observation feedback 3. Progress monitoring of L25 using iReady and common assessment data 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Character Counts Education
Rationale	With an increase in students seeking mental health support and school counselor support, we see a need to increase tier 1 social emotional strategies.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	There will be a decrease in mental health referrals and an increase in points earned through the PBIS behavior management school-wide system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Traci Hemingway (traci.hemingway@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS and mental health referral reports
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We expect to see at least a 2% decrease in mental health or school counselor referrals and an increase of at least 2% in students earning points in the PBIS system.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers in the PBIS System 2. Teachers complete the Kognito Mental Health training 3. Core MTSS team monitors mental health and PBIS data 4. Daily monitoring of referrals 5.
Person Responsible	Traci Hemingway (traci.hemingway@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile in ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile in Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Character Counts Education				\$3,606.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0472 - Liberty Pines Academy			\$3,606.00
			<i>Notes: SAC funds were used to purchase the PBIS school-wide positive behavior management system</i>			
					Total:	\$3,606.00