Lake Academy Leesburg

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Academy Leesburg

2020 TALLEY RD, Leesburg, FL 34748

http://www.lsbc.net/

Demographics

Principal: Rudy Rolle

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-09-02
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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

Lake Academy Leesburg

2020 TALLEY RD, Leesburg, FL 34748

http://www.lsbc.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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.

This program contracts with the Lake County Public schools to provide educational and/or therapeutic services to children who are unable to function in the traditional classrooms. Services at LAKE Academy include individual, group and psychosocial rehabilitation. Treatment/behavior modification is evidence based and strives to promote appropriate behavior necessary for long-term success in school. We believe that creating a therapeutic environment in which students feel supported and emotionally safe increases the opportunities for achieving treatment goals and a successful return to public school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bringing Hope to Life

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
Rolle, Rudy	Principal	Oversee all day to day school operations, including but not limited to hiring, training, staff development, classroom management, scheduling, mapping, parental involvement, and better public relations, etc.
Bradshaw, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
flournoy, danielle	Assistant Principal	
Gardener, Herleesha	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/18/2020, Rudy Rolle

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.*
2

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
14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-09-02
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	2	8	11	11	4	6	10	16	8	9	7	1	93
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	4	3	1	2	2	9	3	5	5	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	3	1	2	4	3	0	1	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4

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	3	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	0	20

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	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	1	6	8	9	3	5	7	8	2	4	5	1	59
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	8
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	1	0	0	6	4	2	1	2	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	12	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	1	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	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	3	3	1	1	1	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	9

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	1	6	8	9	3	5	7	8	2	4	5	1	59
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	8
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	1	0	0	6	4	2	1	2	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	12	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	1	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	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	3	3	1	1	1	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	9

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	68%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	65%	59%	0%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	65%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	59%	56%	0%	64%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	82%	75%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey (table title)

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	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	49%	-49%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	61%	-61%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	20%	59%	-39%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	49%	-49%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	71%	-71%
2018	20%	70%	-50%	71%	-51%
Compare		-20%			

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	3	52		4	22					10	
BLK				9							
WHT	7	50									
FRL	4	50		5	14						

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

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

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	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	89
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	5
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	29
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	18
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

ELA and Math were the lowest scores based on the data attained. 2019-2020 data could not be gathered due to the COVID-19 event shutting down the schools during the last 9 weeks of the school year.

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

Due to the COVID-19 event updated data could not be gathered. Based on the EWS there seems to be an increase in the number of students failing math. This may be due to school closure and lack of participation of students in distance learning.

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.

Data is limited to due to school closure and lack of State testing.

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

FSA- Science 8th grade data. This was the only data available for analysis. NA

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

Attendance and students passing ELA and Math courses.

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

1 Absences
2. Students passing ELA course work
3. Students passing Math course work

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase parental/guardian engagement to reduce absenteeism. If we increase parent/guardian involvement through school events and activities, students will have an opportunity to engage in academic activities which support learning goals and demonstrate growth to their parents/guardians.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students with chronic attendance issues by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rudy Rolle (rrolle@lsbc.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing an attendance team to monitor trends, reach out to parents/guardians and establish student contracts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By approaching attendance issues with a team effort frequent communication with parents/guardians regarding concerns and barriers will be address in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a process of communication using various techniques (emails, phone calls, daily letters, virtual platform, etc) with parents/guardians to ensure timely notification of student achievements, upcoming events or academic/behavior concerns.
2. Increase parent/guardian capacity to help student at home in order to support student needs.

Person Responsible	danielle flournoy (dflournoy@lsbc.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list, achievement in ELA and Math courses are our most critical areas of focus. These Area of Focus were identified as critical areas of need because a majority of students have not demonstrated proficiency through passing grades and state assessments. With differentiated curriculum, authentic literacy and intervention strategies, teachers will be able to structure lessons and assessments to address and evaluate student performance.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase use of math strategies, reading, thinking, talking, and writing opportunities across the curriculum to increase student achievement in Math and ELA proficiencies as evidenced by gains on STAR Math and Reading assessments, classroom assessments and gains on FSA testing scores .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	danielle flournoy (dflournoy@lsbc.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning will be utilized to review data and instruction, in an effort to adapt teaching and instruction to fit the needs of individual groups of students and focus on targeted areas of weakness. utilizing STAR Assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy will allow us to focus on student learning, lessons with purpose, and authentic literacy, in order to increase overall student achievement. Teachers will have an opportunity to share and implement effective teaching strategies and student engagement. STAR Assessment instructional plans allow for teachers to address areas of needs and provides guidelines in doing so.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Establish a common planning schedule for lesson planning to focus on incorporating enrichment opportunities, differentiated practices based on student needs and utilizing student strengths.
2. Conduct site-based professional development and training to teachers 1 Wednesday each month to increase instructional practice proficiency.
3. Complete class walkthroughs to measure impact of professional development and lesson implementation.
4. Monitor STAR assessments every nine weeks for student gains or losses.

Person Responsible	danielle flournoy (dflournoy@lsbc.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

A large portion of the parental population within the special day school are not involved with the students. We have targeted parents through parent night and offering resources fairs and parent lunches in an attempt to come to the school and get involved with their students. In the Fall of 2019 the Parents' Night Event turnout exceeded the prior school year. Due to the COVID-19 event during the second semester of the 2019-2020 school year Parents' Night could not be scheduled.
The school has also implemented the 100% Club which rewards students who achieve perfect attendance and behavior weekly. Student participation has been positive and has improved attendance for some students.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Attendance	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00