

St. Lucie Public Schools

Fairlawn Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Fairlawn Elementary School

3203 RHODE ISLAND AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34947

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fln/>

Demographics

Principal: Heather Ricksecker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2019

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)	58%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 St. Lucie 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

Fairlawn Elementary School will empower students to become life-long learners by giving them ownership of their learning. Students will utilize problem solving skills and effective communication to solve authentic tasks every day.

Provide the school's vision statement

Fairlawn Elementary School will be a high-achieving learning community where all stakeholders work collaboratively to design experiences that will challenge and equip students with the skills needed to be successful in college and/or their chosen career in a globally competitive 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
Ricksecker, Heather	Principal	The principal works closely to monitor student learning throughout the school year. Areas of focus includes data-based decision making, monitoring instruction and providing feedback to teachers to improve instruction and ultimately increase student achievement. The principal is responsible for evaluating, coaching, and monitoring teachers in the school building. She analyzes curriculum/assessment/behavior data, identify patterns and provide support to teachers as well as monitor the data collection process. Administration supports and monitors the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are met. The administration participates in the design of professional development to meet the needs of the staff. The administrative team meets regularly to discuss the status of the school and any needs or decisions that need to be made. She is an instructional leader and example for all.
Gascoigne, Patricia	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an Instructional Leader who is responsible for evaluating, coaching, and monitoring teachers in the school building. The administrator analyzes curriculum/assessment/behavior data identify patterns and provide support to teachers as well as monitor the data collection process. Administration supports and monitors the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are met. The administration participates in the design of professional development to meet the needs of the staff. The administrative team meets regularly to discuss the status of the school and any needs or decisions that need to be made.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/11/2019, Heather Ricksecker

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

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)	58%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast

Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 .	

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	111	109	106	104	105	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	637
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	7	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	108	114	102	105	113	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	2	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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					1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	108	114	102	105	113	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	2	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 1 3 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

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	72%	50%	57%	72%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	64%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	53%	50%	55%	48%
Math Achievement	74%	53%	63%	80%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains	58%	50%	62%	63%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	42%	51%	60%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	56%	46%	53%	79%	51%	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	75%	50%	25%	58%	17%
	2018	77%	46%	31%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	51%	21%	58%	14%
	2018	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	69%	48%	21%	56%	13%
	2018	65%	49%	16%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	55%	23%	62%	16%
	2018	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	54%	26%	64%	16%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	65%	47%	18%	60%	5%
	2018	80%	55%	25%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	46%	10%	53%	3%
	2018	79%	50%	29%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
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	38	34	29	36	38	37	33				
ELL	48	59	60	67	59						
BLK	60	63	67	60	58	35	24				
HSP	73	58	53	79	58	50	57				
MUL	60			73							
WHT	78	65	12	78	57	37	72				
FRL	68	64	50	67	53	38	41				

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	47	36	58	60	75					
ELL	56			72							
BLK	53	55	46	64	49	57	58				
HSP	76	80	70	83	65		79				
MUL	90			80							
WHT	78	61	44	85	66	58	85				
FRL	65	60	51	74	60	56	72				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	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	
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	54
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	62
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	67
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	57
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	56
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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is the bottom quartile of students mainly in Math and then in English. Contributing factors may lend itself to the increased need of support for students with disabilities with limited time for a small number of support personnel to cover the needs of the growing number of students. This subgroup indicated the students with disabilities made up most of the subgroup and a trend set indicating an increase in numbers over the years with limited support.

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

The bottom quartile in Math component showed the greatest decline from the prior year according to the simulation of grades. The factors that contributed to it were the need for a more in-depth teaching of the math content in grades 3 through 5 for these identified students. Contribution to this decline indicates the poor use of the Math unit assessments and monitoring for the bottom quartile.

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

When compared to the state average, the data component with the greatest gap is the bottom quartile of students mainly in Math and then in English. Contributing factors may lend itself to the increased need of support for students with disabilities with limited time for a small number of support personnel to cover the needs of the growing number of students. This subgroup indicated the students with disabilities made up most of the subgroup and a trend set indicating an increase in numbers over the years with limited support.

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

The data component that was able to maintain its' standing was the ELA component. Improvement would be linked to the constant trend in maintaining a reading focus throughout the year with an offering on early tutoring for students indicating the need. Reading across varying content was a focus, as well as, an increase focus to build on the rigor in planning meaningful and relatable lessons for students. Additional challenges and competitions were offered to students in hopes of supporting the reading initiative throughout the year. Every child was given the same book to read with their parents. Community members came to school to assist with reading the book. These challenges and competitions as well as others contributed to Fairlawn maintaining their status in ELA.

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

An area of concern that will be addressed is the number of students with Level 1 on statewide assessment. These students are identified and placed in specialized teachers' classrooms and specific remediation strategies are put in place to assist these students in closing their achievement gaps. Unique schedules with a Resource waiver, additional

small group differentiated groups with double dosing and tutorial services before or after school will be provided.

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

1. 1. Regain "A"-rated school grade
2. Improve in all school data components and meet targets set
3. Decrease EWS data

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Analysis of teacher and student climate surveys, student discipline data, the number of mental health referrals and staff and student attendance data indicate a need to address the social emotional learning needs of our school.

Measurable Outcome: Student perception of sense of belonging and safety will increase by 25% as measured by the student climate survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Patricia Gascoigne (patricia.gascoigne@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/School-Connect will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walkthrough tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students are lacking many of these basic life skills needed for success in school, at home and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance and develop positive learning communities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development
2. Follow-up Coaching by the SEL Department
3. Implementation of Student SEL activities

Person Responsible: Patricia Gascoigne (patricia.gascoigne@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Through the structured collaborative process, differentiated rotation activities and the district approved learning programs, the level of student proficiency will increase as reflected in ongoing achievement data measures. Evidence of a need to focus on the structured collaborative process, differentiated rotation activities and the district approved learning programs, the goal for the level of student proficiency will increase as reflected in ongoing achievement data measures.

Measureable Outcome: Reflecting on the ongoing achievement data measures with a focus on improving all data components.
 Improve 15 points in the lowest 25 percentile in Math.
 Improve 10 points in Science.
 Improve in Learning Gains for ALL students for both Reading by (+1) and Math by (+5) to equal 6 points increase.
 Utilizing iobservation data and analyzing the collaboration process and trends the data reflect by teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Ricksecker (heather.ricksecker@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Groups will be fluid as documented in planning, documentation of intervention progress monitoring and grouping, planned differentiated rotation activities, Lexile growth as evidenced by Reading Counts, formal/informal observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students are lacking the growth needed in both ELA and Math so intentional focus on differentiated groups to close the achievement gap for struggling students. With a collaborative effort, well-planned differentiated rotation activities will deepen the knowledge of students and build on fluency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Scheduled Collaborative Planning and Data Reflection.
2. Monitor Collaborative Planning Sessions and Data Chats.
3. Include Professional Development by district staff and follow-up by administration.
4. Ongoing review data with reflection.

Person Responsible Heather Ricksecker (heather.ricksecker@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading and math.

Measureable Outcome: The number of student with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA and Math will increase by 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Ricksecker (heather.ricksecker@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The number of student with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA and Math will increase by 25%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To provide a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be trained in UDL planning through FDLRS.

Person Responsible Heather Ricksecker (heather.ricksecker@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining school-wide improvement priorities will be addressed through continuous monitoring and reflection of the data. Periodic checks will be conducted to include the evaluation of teachers while teaching the content and focusing on the areas of student needs in closing the achievement gaps.

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.

Fairlawn has a very active Parent Teacher Organization as well as a School Advisory Committee that both have memberships of parents and teachers. We also have several activities throughout the year where families and students come to the school building for events such as Parent Night, Take Your Dad to School Day, Grandparent's Day and Honors Assemblies that bridge home to school. Our school's vision and mission are posted throughout the school, in each classroom, on our website and is in each student's planner. We have an online gradebook for families to monitor their student's academic progress and communicate with their teachers. Additionally, we utilize a School Messenger system to keep parents informed about activities and pertinent information throughout the school-year. Facebook and Twitter are also used to highlight activities and disseminate school information. A monthly parent newsletter is sent to families each month and is posted on the school's website.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00