

Polk County Public Schools

Polk Full Time Eschool



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Polk Full Time Eschool

604 S. CENTRAL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

Demographics

Principal: Deron Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Polk Full Time Eschool

604 S. CENTRAL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2014-15
Grade	I	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

To provide a high-quality education to all students allowing them to excel as successful and responsible online learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Polk Virtual School is to deliver a high-quality technology-based education that guides students to grade level proficiency, high school graduation and college and/or career preparation.

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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Williams, Deron	Principal	<p>The Principal's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Facilitate implementation of MTSS process *Contract with state approved instruction/course providers for online learning *Create a system in which student pacing is monitored. *Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development *Analyze student data to determine achievements and opportunities for growth *Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS process *Implement tier 2 or tier 3 interventions *Conduct observations to monitor the effectiveness of instruction
--------------------	-----------	---

Each member of the school-based leadership team will analyze the data and help create and implement necessary action plans for students to show learning gains.

Hartman, Laura	Other	<p>The TRST's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monitor each student's progress and Pace *Attend MTSS Team meetings *Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction *Support the Implementation of tier 2 and 3 interventions *Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotes of interventions implemented *Collect school-wide data for the team to use in determining struggling learners *Attend MTSS Team meetings for tier 2 and tier 3 students
-------------------	-------	--

Williams, Andrea	School Counselor	<p>The School Counselor's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provides expertise and support in guiding students academically. *Participating in MTSS meetings and assisting in the creation MTSS behavior, action and support plans. *Assist MTSS team with interventions
---------------------	---------------------	---

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	9	5	4	6	7	11	16	18	34	29	33	32	40	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	3	7	3	1	24

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

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

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

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

22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

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	0	1	1	0	1	3	2	2	1	7	6	6	6	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	2	2	2	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	4	1	4	1	9	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4	5	4	1	22

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	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	13

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	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	9 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	11 (0)	16 (0)	18 (0)	34 (0)	29 (0)	33 (0)	32 (0)	40 (0)	244 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	24 (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.

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	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	48%	-48%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	73%	48%	25%	54%	19%
	2018	43%	41%	2%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
07	2019	61%	42%	19%	52%	9%
	2018	39%	42%	-3%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	71%	48%	23%	56%	15%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	58%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
09	2019	74%	45%	29%	55%	19%
	2018	45%	43%	2%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				
10	2019	55%	42%	13%	53%	2%
	2018	62%	42%	20%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	33%	40%	-7%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	75%	39%	36%	54%	21%
	2018	33%	40%	-7%	54%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		42%				
Cohort Comparison		42%				
08	2019	29%	35%	-6%	46%	-17%
	2018	0%	34%	-34%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	37%	41%	-4%	48%	-11%
	2018	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		37%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	54%	-2%	67%	-15%
2018	64%	59%	5%	65%	-1%
Compare		-12%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	70%	10%	71%	9%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		80%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	50%	-21%	61%	-32%
2018	50%	60%	-10%	62%	-12%
Compare		-21%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	53%	8%	57%	4%
2018	50%	41%	9%	56%	-6%
Compare		11%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	64										
HSP	75	70		62	45						
WHT	69	56		57	43		44	55			
FRL	53	53		47	44						
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	64										
HSP	75	70		62	45						
WHT	69	56		57	43		44	55			
FRL	53	53		47	44						
2017 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
BLK	64										
HSP	75	70		62	45						
WHT	69	56		57	43		44	55			
FRL	53	53		47	44						

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	73%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest performance data come from the Algebra 1 EOC. Only 29% of our students achieved level 3 or above.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was Algebra 1. Based on last year's data, 58% of the students achieved a level 3 or above. This year only 29% of our students achieved level 3 or above.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is percent of students tested for FSA/EOC. The school had 73% for the students participate in state testing. The state average is above 96%. Polk Virtual's students live in all parts of Polk County. Many of our families have one or no transportation. As a school, last year we did not have a hard policy tying enrollment to state testing. Many of the families made excuses as to why they were not able to show up for testing.

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

The component with the greatest improvement is 7th grade math. Based on the 2017-18 school year data 33% of the students achieved a level 3 or above. In the 2018-19 school year, 75% of the students achieved a level 3 or above.

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

Based on our school's EWS data. 33 students were identified as having more than one EWS indicator. Of those 33 students, 24, are identified with a level one

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

1. Increasing our percent tested for FSA and EOCs from 73% to 95% or above.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing the percent of students tested to 95% or above
Rationale	It is a state requirement that at least 95% of the schools tested population participate in the state assessments. The 2018-19 school year we tested on 73%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In the school 2019-20 our goal is that 95% or more of our student population will participate in the state FSA/EOC testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Make parents and students aware that testing is a requirement and not an option as well as when and where their individual testing will be offered. It is our goal to provide our parents and students with every opportunity to participate in state testing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence shows that participation increases when people are aware of the goal. It is our intention to ensure that parents and students understand that participating in state testing is a requirements for enrollment into the virtual school.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy that test is mandatory and student enrollment is an agreement that students will participate in all testing was created is now a part of the application process. 2. During the summer, five new parent/students informational meetings were held during the summer. In these meetings new parents/students where told the mandatory testing policy and provided the testing agreement. 3. Testing percent data has been shared with the staff. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Teachers will post the mandatory testing policy on their virtual pages b. Students have been assigned Homeroom teachers. The Homeroom teachers will be an additional contact person to help in the communication of testing for students. 4. August 8th we held a meeting with Polk's AAE to discuss our plan for testing and make ups. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students will test at their zones schools due to proximity. b. Zone schools will receive the secure testing documents for students at least two weeks prior to testing. c. Parents/Students have been notified that students IDs are needed for testing. Students that don't have can come to the Virtual Office at anytime to have one printed. 5. The testing schedules for the district were mailed to all parents during the second week of school. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Parents/Students will be notified of the specific date, time and location for each test. b. During our monthly students Face to Face meetings we will continually inform students about testing dates and requirements.

Person Responsible Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

#2

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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).

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, Â§ 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.

Not a Title 1 funded school

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.

Not a Title 1 funded school

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

Not a Title 1 funded school

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.

Not a Title 1 funded school

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

Not a Title 1 funded school

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing the percent of students tested to 95% or above	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00