

Leon County Schools

SEALEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 8
 - D. Early Warning Systems 9
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 12
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 13
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 14
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 15
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 16
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 19
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 20
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 31
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 33
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 37
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 38

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Leon County School Board on School Board Approved on September 23, 2025.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Sealey Elementary Math and Science Magnet School prepares students to be responsible, respectful and independent learners who will grow in his/her intellectual, physical and emotional development in a way that increases academic performance and encourages student and school success.

Provide the school's vision statement

The Sealey Elementary Community is dedicated to the process of engaging successful, safe and respectful academic achievers who appreciate diversity and the foundations of the learning environment in order to foster a spirit that conscientiously contributes to our society.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Demetria Clemons

demetria.clemons@leonschools.net

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the management of all school functions.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Leslie Moore

leslie.moore@leonschools.net

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist in the management of all school functions.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Laurel Bryant

laurel.bryant@leonschools.net

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for primary students.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Sonja Daymond

sonja.daymond@leonschools.net

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for intermediate students.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Mindy Shaffer

mindy.shaffer@leonschools.net

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the management of Reading curriculum, interventions, and progress monitoring.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Heather Kidd

heather.kidd@leonschools.net

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for assisting in managing classroom behavior and implementing behavior plans.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Amy Lato

amy.lato@leonschools.net

Position Title

Psychologist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students brought to the MTSS team.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Kristen Obert

kristen.obert@leonschools.net

Position Title

Staffing Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for ensuring state and federal compliance when considering students to receive exceptional student services.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Maggie Brown

maggie.brown@leonschools.net

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students with behavior concerns brought to the MTSS team.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Jeanne Thorbjornsen

jeanne.thorbjornsen@leonschools.net

Position Title

Social Worker

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with home and school life.

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name

Chandra Hayes-Denson

chandra.hayes@leonschools.net

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for tracking student evaluations, parent requests, and interventions within the MTSS/ RtI process. Coordinates meetings with staff and parents. 504 Coordinator for the school.

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name

Anne Marie Lock

anne-marie.lock@leonschools.net

Position Title

Speech and Language Pathologist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for evaluating students based on speech and language concerns. Provides therapy

services to identified students.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name

Laura Camoesas

laura.camoesas@leonschools.net

Position Title

Media Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for developing the Collection Development Plan.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP Committee consisting of leadership and teachers meets to discuss previous year's state testing data and ESSA results. Team discusses reasonable growth and identifies strategies that can be used to achieve those goals, as well as recognize barriers that will need to be overcome. Once drafted, the SIP goes before SAC for approval with a public forum for discussion and possible revision.

3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The leadership team will monitor student progress quarterly and hold data meetings with grade level to discuss how to best support meeting the SIP goals. This progress will be communicated at quarterly SAC meetings, so all stakeholders are aware on the school's continuous improvement

efforts.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	84.2%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)* BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)* WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: C 2023-24: C 2022-23: C 2021-22: C 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	67	44	62	56	63	74				366
Absent 10% or more school days	11	6	12	8	12	19				68
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	5	5	7				21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	5	7	11	12	10	10				55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	7	14	12	12	14	16				75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	3	2	4	5	9	6				29
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Current Year 2025-26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		4	6	4	7	7				28

Current Year 2025-26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	2	1	1	0	0				5
Students retained two or more times										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	8	6	12	5	13	11				55
One or more suspensions		1	2	3	4	16				26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	28	39	29		3				100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		28	38	35		4				105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)				1						1
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		5	12	5	2	4				28

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	3	2	2						8
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	57	59	59	53	56	57	47	54	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	47	61	59	63	59	58	49	56	53
ELA Learning Gains	64	59	60	55	58	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63	56	56	51	52	57			
Math Achievement*	56	64	64	48	60	62	45	56	59
Math Learning Gains	59	63	63	47	59	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35	53	51	49	47	52			
Science Achievement	43	55	58	35	54	57	37	52	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	64	55	63		62	61		52	59

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	54%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	488
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
54%	50%	45%	53%	35%		58%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	43%	No		
English Language Learners	34%	Yes	1	
Black/African American Students	57%	No		
Hispanic Students	51%	No		
Multiracial Students	35%	Yes	3	
White Students	67%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	47%	64%	63%	56%	59%	35%	43%					64%
Students With Disabilities	32%	18%	61%	80%	27%	54%	50%	22%					
English Language Learners	30%		38%	30%	20%	23%							64%
Black/African American Students	55%	36%	65%	81%	54%	65%	53%	47%					
Hispanic Students	59%		58%		53%	33%							
Multiracial Students	31%				38%								
White Students	76%		75%		71%	64%		50%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	38%	65%	75%	45%	54%	50%	33%					

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.
								GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	53%	63%	55%	51%	48%	47%	49%	35%		
Students With Disabilities	35%	58%	40%	50%	21%	33%	47%	31%		
Black/African American Students	54%	59%	61%	62%	47%	44%	55%	29%		
Hispanic Students	58%				50%					
Multiracial Students	28%		33%		22%	47%		20%		
White Students	62%	78%	55%		62%	58%		47%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	42%	52%	46%	48%	38%	41%	46%	21%		

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	47%	49%			45%			37%					
Students With Disabilities	23%	16%			18%			15%					
Black/African American Students	45%	52%			37%			31%					
Hispanic Students	40%				40%								
Multiracial Students	42%				33%			30%					
White Students	60%	50%			71%			58%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	41%	40%			35%			32%					

E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	47%	57%	-10%	57%	-10%
ELA	4	66%	55%	11%	56%	10%
ELA	5	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Math	3	47%	63%	-16%	63%	-16%
Math	4	61%	61%	0%	62%	-1%
Math	5	52%	56%	-4%	57%	-5%
Science	5	40%	51%	-11%	55%	-15%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

There were several data components in which showed tremendous improvement. The first data component that showed great improvement was in 4th Grade ELA proficiency. On the 2024 statewide assessment 48 percent of all 4th grade students met the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. However, on the 2025 state assessment, 67 percent of 4th grade students met the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. Contributing to this 19 percent job in students meeting grade level expectations was a strong 3rd grade teacher looping up with his 3rd grade students. This stability with instruction provided a strong foundation to dig into the benchmarks to meet mastery. Another data component that demonstrated tremendous growth was 5th Grade Math proficiency. On the 2024 statewide assessment 34 percent of 5th grade students met the the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. On the 2025 statewide assessment, 53 percent of 5th grade students met the statewide expectation of a Level 3 or higher. The addition of a new, highly-effective math teacher was a contributing factor to the 19 percent increase in math proficiency.

Lowest Performance

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 on the 2025 statewide assessment was 4th grade lowest quartile math learning gains, with only 7 percent of these students showing learning gains. A contributing factor to the lowest quartile not showing learning gains was the addition of a teacher who was new to 4th grade math content.

Greatest Decline

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the 2024 school year was the percentage of 3rd grade students who met state expectations of a Level 3 or higher on the statewide Math assessment. On the 2024 statewide assessment 65 percent of students scored a Level 3 or higher, while only 47 percent of scored a Level 3 or higher in 2025. Many students were 3 points or less away from a Level 3. Focusing on curriculum rather than benchmarks and rigor led to students not

meeting grade level expectations.

Greatest Gap

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.

Overall, the greatest gap existed with 3rd grade students' achievement on the Math assessment. Only 47 percent of 3rd grade students met the state achievement expectation of a Level 3 or higher as compared to the statewide average of 63 percent. Focusing on curriculum rather than benchmarks and rigor led to students not meeting the state expectations for achievement.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

One area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide Math assessment (75).

Another area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90 percent (68).

Highest Priorities

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

1. Continued support and improvement for identified ESSA subgroups not meeting the Federal Index, Multi-racial and ELL, with support for our SWD who did meet the Federal Index for the first time in 5 years.
2. Monitor and intervening when noticing patterns of poor attendance.
3. Increase support and development of Math and Reading instruction. to also incorporate intervention strategies for Math and Reading.
4. Increase performance on the Science assessment.
5. Focus on Learning Gains for all students but especially those in the lowest quartile.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Multiracial Students (MUL)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the Federal Index and in relation with Every Student Succeeds Act, Multi-racial students did not meet the minimum Federal Index of 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to see this subgroup meet the minimum requirement of 41 percent.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, Lexia, and IXL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Lexia Power School, Individualized teacher-led instruction.

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Identify Tier 2 and 3 students who fit into the ESSA subgroup.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will identify students from the identified ESSA groups who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #2

Develop intervention groups to support student growth and achievement.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students from the identified ESSA group who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #3

Monitor student data for efficacy.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Sealey experienced a large discrepancy in the percentage of students in 3rd Grade who scored a

Level 3 or higher on the statewide Math assessment, 47 percent, as compared to the State average of 63 percent. The focus for the 2025-2026 school year will be increasing the number of students who score a Level 3 or higher, closing the gap with the State's average.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey plans to raise the overall percentage of students in 3rd Grade who score a Level 3 or higher to at least 55 percent.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district Progress Monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR Math, and IXL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

IXL, STAR Math, Instructional Coaching, Ready

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action

step:

Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

Action Step #2

Monitor Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Sealey experienced a large discrepancy in the percentage of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the statewide ELA assessment, 48 percent, as compared to the State average of 57 percent. Each grade level (3-5) must meet the minimum threshold of 50percent of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the state assessment. If a grade level does not meet this requirement, the school is identified as a RAISE school. Sealey has been identified as a Universal Support school (Tier 1) based on the 3rd grade FAST ELA results.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades K-2 will receive 30 minutes of UFLI instruction daily during the 90 minute reading block. Students will also develop listening comprehension, deepen vocabulary, and develop writing skills using SAVVAS. Each grade level participates in "Walk to Read" time each day. This time allows students to receive additional support based on their individual needs. Students who require Tier 3 interventions, receive those during this time. Other students may receive acceleration based on progress monitoring data.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

In addition to their 90 minute reading block, each grade level has a "Walk to Read" time each day. This 45-minute block of time is designed to provide support to students based on their progress monitoring data. Students requiring Tier 3 interventions will receive them during this time. Students

who do not require Tier 3 interventions will be grouped together based on needs..

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

No Answer Entered

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

Sealey's 3rd grade data will meet the minimum threshold of 50 percent through continued coaching, Walk to Read, and data chats. There will be increased emphasis on complexity of the task presented to students and ensuring student fluency.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Administration will conduct data chats on a monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, and Lexia

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Sealey has added two intervention specialists to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction. Sealey will use Lexia, UFLI, and Savvas to support student achievement.

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:**Rationale:****Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:****Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Description of Intervention #3:**Rationale:****Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Literacy Leadership

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The Literacy team will meet monthly to collaborate how to better support student literacy. The team will analyze progress monitoring data and discuss classroom walkthroughs, highlighting areas of success and areas for support.

Action Step #2

Literacy Coaching

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Administration will meet with the literacy coach to identify teachers who would benefit from literacy coaching each month. Mrs. Shaffer will work to develop a coaching cycle to support identified teachers. Administration will continue walkthroughs to ensure that the coaching has shown improvement.

Action Step #3

Professional Learning

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Sealey will host quarterly professional development opportunities to support faculty growth in literacy instruction.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to English Language Learners (ELL)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the Federal Index and in relation with Every Student Succeeds Act, Multiracial students did not meet the minimum Federal Index of 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to of this subgroup meet the minimum requirement of 41 percent.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, Lexia, and IXL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Lexia Power School, Individualized teacher-led instruction

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Identifying Students Who Need Tiered Support

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will

identify students from the identified ESSA groups who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #2

Developing Tier 2 and Tier 3 Groups

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students from the identified ESSA group who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #3

Monitoring for Efficacy

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #5

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the Federal Index and in relation with Every Student Succeeds Act, Students with Disabilities did meet the minimum Federal Index of 41 percent for the first time in 5 years. Students with disabilities (SWD) moved from 35 percent to 43 percent, an 8 percent increase from the 2023-2024 school year. Though our SWD population did meet the threshold, it remains an area of intense focus.

BPIE goal

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to see this subgroup meet the 45 percent.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, Lexia, and IXL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Lexia Power School, Individualized teacher-led instruction

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Identifying Tier 2 and Tier 3 students who fit into the ESSA subgroup.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will identify students from the identified ESSA groups who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #2

Develop intervention groups to support student growth and achievement.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students from the identified ESSA group who did not score a Level 3 or better

or are not showing gains during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #3

Monitor student data for efficacy.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to our Early Warning System indicators, there were 68 students who were absent 10% or more of school days. That was approximately 17% of our student population

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to lower the number of students absent 10% or more of the available school days by at least 8 students.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled to track student attendance. Monthly meetings with Sealey's attendance committee will be held to discuss ways to intervene.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable

outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Sealey's attendance committee, comprised of administration, guidance, social worker, and teachers will work to develop plans of actions, which can include community resources, possible transportation, and before/after school care.

Rationale:

Childcare and transportation have been notable barriers for some families with students having poor attendance. Understanding and attempting to address these barriers may lead to improve school attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Weekly Attendance Reports

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled to determine students who may have absentee patterns.

Action Step #2

Monthly Attendance Meetings

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The Attendance Committee will hold monthly meetings to develop plans to support student attendance.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

Sealey builds the School Improvement Plan with a group of teacher leaders. Data is disaggregated, reviewed, and priorities set for the upcoming school year. Once a plan is created, it is presented to our School Advisory Council (SAC) for review and approval. Throughout the course of the year, student progress and school efforts are reported to SAC. At this time, community members and parents are able to ask questions, provide feedback, and discuss possible decisions for improvement. The SIP is posted to the school's website at the following address: [https://www.leonschools.net/ domain/ 5322](https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5322)

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Sealey communicates school information to our families through a variety of formats: school newsletter, school Facebook page, listserv, Parent Portal, and the school website. In addition, teachers send home weekly reports, and newsletters to keep the parents informed of individual classroom information. Teachers also communicate with families through individual notes, emails, text messages, and web pages. At the beginning of the year, grade levels host an open house so that parents can learn firsthand the expectations and routines of their children's classrooms, and all teachers hold a conference with parents during the first semester. Throughout the year, the school

invites parents to numerous activities held at Sealey, including the Veteran's Day Assembly, Science Night, Black History Assembly, strings and chorus performances, and Family Literacy Nights.

The PFEP plan is posted to the school's website at the following address:

<https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5708>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

Sealey will utilize a planned block of instruction that will specifically target student needs. This block of time is structured based on providing an opportunity to remediate, review, and enrich to strengthen the learning opportunities within the classroom. Student groups are developed based on progress monitoring and state-wide assessment data, which adjust based upon student growth. Specific skills are targeted or extended based on data collected.

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Sealey ensures mental health services and counseling for students by employing a full-time school counselor and a mental health professional to support students. We have a continued partnership with local mental health agencies to offer counseling and mentoring services. Sealey promotes a school climate that encourages students to seek help when needed. During monthly data chats and attendance meetings, there is system to identify students who may benefit from counseling services.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Sealey provides awareness of postsecondary and workforce opportunities in a variety of ways. We collaborate with local colleges, universities, and vocational schools for campus visits. Career exploration activities are embedded in classroom discussions and activities. Various professionals in Tallahassee are invited to speak to students to provide insight into various careers.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

Sealey uses a schoolwide PBIS model to support student behavior. Through this plan, there are established schoolwide expectations and rules are communicated consistently. Students are rewarded for their positive choices through grade-level incentive programs tailored to the needs of the students. There is continuous monitoring and analyzing of student discipline data to identify areas of need.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Sealey strives to maintain a positive school culture and a supporting work environment that values and respects all members of the school community. Veteran teachers mentor those who are new to Sealey to provide support and guidance. Sealey fosters a collaborative environment that encourages teachers to work together and participate in the decision-making process. There are multiple opportunities for paraprofessionals to participate in workshops to further their training.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Sealey assists students with the transition from preschool to elementary school by collaborating with local preschools to share information about incoming students and conducting transition meetings with parents to discuss school expectations. There is an annual "Meet the Teacher" event before the school year begins where families can meet with their classroom teacher to discuss classroom and teacher specific expectations.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Once funding allocations are received, the school improvement committee reviews the School Improvement Plan to determine the greatest need of students as determined by the previous year's data collection and analysis. Improvement plans are developed looking at site-based, District, and out-of-county professional development and training opportunities. These opportunities are presented to the School Advisory Council for discussion, approval, and, ultimately, effectiveness.

Moreover, Sealey is in the State's Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) category due to our English Language Learners (ELL) and Multiracial sub-populations not meeting the 41% threshold on the Federal index. These students are often represented within our planning for improvement goals, but special attention is paid to opportunities that could specifically impact this sub-population and follow a similar path when reviewing funding allocations as stated previously.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Often, English Language Learners (ELL) require additional support to ensure that they meet grade level expectations for success. To meet the needs of these students we will provide instruction in a small group setting. Resources that will be used to support ELL and Multiracial students will include: UFLI, Wordly Wise, Ready Math, Magnetic Reading, and Measuring Up. UFLI lessons will be provided to students in grades K-5, should the students require additional support in foundational reading skills. Wordly Wise is an academic language program that develops the link between vocabulary and reading comprehension. Ready Math and Measuring Up Math will be utilized to support students in filling in gaps of knowledge and to move students towards grade level expectations. Magnet Reading and Measuring Up Reading will be utilized to provide targeted instruction for benchmarks students are struggling to master.

Students will take a diagnostic assessment during the month of August to determine their needs. Diagnostic data will be reviewed by the administrative team to determine the target areas for each student and to create groups. These groups will meet daily, beginning no later than 9/3/2024, using the aforementioned materials to support students. Student success will be monitored monthly using STAR Reading and iReady Math Growth assessments.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00