Lake Virtual Franchise School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Virtual Franchise

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), 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 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); 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, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), 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; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: The mission of Lake County Virtual School is to provide a personalized, mastery-based education in a safe, supportive online environment that promotes self discipline, motivation, and excellence in learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: The vision of Lake County Virtual School to operate as a school of excellence that meets the virtual learning needs of ALL Lake County students

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Paul	Principal	School Performance Leadership; Professional Development Evaluations Instructional Initiatives Office Operations SAC
King, Derrick	Assistant Principal	School Performance Leadership; Professional Development School Student Services ESE Evaluations Facilities
Clark, Stacie	School Counselor	Leadership School Students Services 504 Scheduling Scholarship and Graduation Clubs
Martin, Samantha	Staffing Specialist	ESE Leadership Testing Support
Eichelberger, Jennie	Math Coach	Math Coach (K-12) Intensive Reading 6-8 Liaison K-5, Gr. 12 Intensive Support
Lewis, Cathy	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach Intensive Reading K-5 Liaison K-5, Gr. 12 Intensive Support
Montuori, Vincent	Teacher, K-12	Senior Support Specialist (Graduation Resource Facilitator) SS Teacher
Casamona, Alisha	Attendance/Social Work	Mental Health Liaison Home Education Contact Social Work and Triage Support Specialist
Patrick, Ayita	Parent Engagement Liaison	Testing Coordinator Communication Liaison

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
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. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

LCVS utilizes a Leadership Team (members listed above) to develop the SIP and then presents the SIP to the SAC (which includes all Stakeholders - parents, students, community members, etc.) for input and approval.

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's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The progress of the SIP will be regularly monitored at weekly Leadership Team Meetings, monthly SAC Meetings, as well as quarterly Student Data Chat Sessions which include all teachers, support staff, and school administration. Specific Tiered interventions will be implemented as needed based on student data.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	30%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: I 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	8	7	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	5	3	4	10	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	6	2	3	3	2	8	7	35

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	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	11

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially 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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	5	9	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	6	8	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	6

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	5	9	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	6	8	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	6

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

(Grade Level column group spans K–8)

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that 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.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	62	53	57	64	55	56		
ELA Learning Gains				54			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			34		
Math Achievement*	46	68	55	43	44	42	45		
Math Learning Gains				49			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			22		
Science Achievement*	50	61	52	53	65	54	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	84	68	64	66	59	71		
Middle School Acceleration	30	73	70	54	54	51	36		
Graduation Rate	61	63	74	71	58	50	97		
College and Career Acceleration	47	35	53	55	82	70	58		
ELP Progress		59	55		64	70			

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.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	89
Graduation Rate	71

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 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%
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	55			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	51			

2022-23 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%
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 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%
SWD	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	52			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	42			

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. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	55			46			50	60	30	61	47	
SWD	36			25			27	29		20	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61			39			40	73			4	
HSP	62			40			47	58		60	6	
MUL	43			54							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	54			48			49	62	38	50	7	
FRL	35			24			19	50		25	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	54	36	43	49	37	53	64	54	71	55	
SWD	31	34	24	13	32	36	17	17		61	36	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56	45		30	57		44	57		59	47	
HSP	57	44	27	37	55		43	75		68	58	
MUL	53	44		33	43							
PAC												
WHT	65	62	50	53	45	29	67	69	69	76	57	
FRL	44	43	24	27	40	36	47	38		63	56	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	56	49	34	45	32	22	50	71	36	97	58	
SWD	19	30	28	17	24	28	29	55				
ELL	41	48	33	25	30		29					
AMI												
ASN	71	69		55	25							
BLK	47	45	26	32	24	8	43	59	20			
HSP	49	47	40	36	34	38	37	57	24			
MUL	54	52		46	45		46	75	27			
PAC												
WHT	62	51	35	53	33	20	60	77	45	96	54	
FRL	42	43	33	31	29	23	37	45	8	100	69	

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	47%	44%	3%	50%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	43%	19%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	46%	6%	47%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	61%	44%	17%	48%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	54%	6%	58%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	73%	46%	27%	47%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	55%	4%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	48%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	61%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	56%	-10%	55%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	44%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	51%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	50%	-5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	63%	0%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	66%	0%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	63%	-3%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

8th Grade Science was lowest at 36% Achievement. Several factors include: Teacher Load (our 8th grade Science Teacher taught 3 others courses and also had the highest student load of any teacher last year) and 8th Grade Overall Performance (our 8th grade cohort was one of our lower performing groups overall in ELA, Math, and Science). We plan to ensure more even student loads this coming year as we have an extensive pool of adjunct teachers available to support our full time teachers. We also plan to extensively support the 9th grade cohort that will be taking the bulk of our ALG 1, BIO, and ELA 1 high school courses.

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

8th Grade Science declined the most at -26 pts. Several factors include: Teacher Load (our 8th grade Science Teacher taught 3 others courses and also had the highest student load of any teacher last year) and 8th Grade Overall Performance (our 8th grade cohort was one of our lower performing groups overall in ELA, Math, and Science). We plan to ensure more even student loads this coming year as we have an extensive pool of adjunct teachers available to support our full time teachers. We also plan to

extensively support the 9th grade cohort that will be taking the bulk of our ALG 1, BIO, and ELA 1 high school courses.

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.

4th and 5th Grade Math had the largest gap at -12pts each. In looking back to last year's data, our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade math achievement scores were very low (39%, 34%, and 25% respectively). 3rd, 4th and 5th grade math were major focus areas for the 22-23 school year and we were happy to see gains (+24 pts, +6 pts, and +18pts respectively). However, 4th and 5th grade math will continue to be a focus area as we close the gap and exceed state performance.

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

3rd Grade Math saw a +24 Pts increase. Again, as a major focus area, our Elementary PLT and our Math Coach provided small group and one-on-one instruction and intervention as needed (EQUIP Sessions through ZOOM). The purpose of EQUIP sessions is to "equip" students with strategies for Evaluating their own effort, asking Questions to teachers and other students during instruction and collaboration, Understanding and showing mastery of content, completing work Independently, and celebrating their Progress (Evaluating, Questions, Understanding, Independently, Progress).

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

We see one area of concern in the amount of students showing two or more signs, specifically the increase in numbers as the age/ grade of the student increases. Our MTSS Team will need to focus on the progression of students year over year.

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

1. Elementary Academics: K-2 Stabalization, K-5 Math Intervention, PLT Continuation
2. MS Academics: Science and Math Intervention, PLT Continuation
3. HS Academics: ELA Intervention for incoming 9th Grad, ALG 1/GEO Intervention, Increasing EOC/AP Perf.
4. Students With Disabilities: Improving performance above 41% (causation of ATSI status)
5. Graduation Rate: Achieving 90+% Grad Rate; ELA/Math Bootcamp Interventions

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As LCVS is striving to be a school of excellence, we want to ensure our RTI practices, including Tier 1, 2, and 3, are benefiting ALL students. As the 2021-2022 Learning Gains showed (ELA LG = 54%, Math LG = 49%), we need to improve our RTI practices.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

1. We will improve our ELA LG by 6 pts to 60%.
2. We will improve out Math LG by 6 pts to 55%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor this area of focus through Quarterly Student Data Chats (that include PM 1, PM 2, LSA, iReady (if in use), STAR, and classroom performance data, etc.) with faculty and staff. We will also include MTSS updates and reports in weekly Leadership Team Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

RTI = Student Success: if we improve our RTI process and, specifically, the amount and types of interventions, we will make gains in student success. We will utilize small-group instruction (EQUIP sessions), one-on-one support (in-person and virtual), collaborative Discussion Based Assessment's, and LCVS' "Relearn, Redo, and Resubmit" process for all assignments. We will also track student progress and response more accurately by including teachers in the documentation process and intervention process through consistent communication with the MTSS Team. For MS/HS students, we will utilize LCVS' "Math and ELA Bootcamps" conducted throughout the year (these proved very successful last year, specifically with out HS students who still needed to pass ELA/Math for graduation purposes - 83% success rate)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"Research proves that RTI is twice as powerful as any single environmental factor that can impact student success" (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P. 46)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Launch new LCVS RTI/MTSS Intervention plan developed at Summer Leadership; discuss and train faculty and staff on Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions, extensions, and processes; ensure faculty and staff know where they impact the plan and, more importantly, student success.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Develop and Implement a calendar for both virtual and in-person interventions for Tier 1 and 2; include teacher sign-ups for timeframes and spaces on campus for in-person.

Person Responsible: Ayita Patrick (patricka@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Ensure that faculty and MTSS Team meet during faculty meeting time to discuss students that need to transition from Tier 1 (virtual/in-person) to Tier 2 (in-person/mandatory) interventions or Tier 3 (virtual/in-person, one-on-one w/ interventionist/mandatory) interventions.

Person Responsible: Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Conduct ELA and Math Bootcamps (in-person tutoring and intervention support) for the most "at risk of not graduating" students (level 1 and 2 students, specifically in 11th and 12th grade) to provide interventions and support. **SAI Funds will be used to support the ELA and Math Bootcamps.

Person Responsible: Stacie Clark (clarks2@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023 February/March 2024

Ensure weekly Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and extension sessions are being conducted in-person and virtually as needed. Supplies, technology, and math manipulative sets will be needed (paid for from SAC or Administrative funds).

Person Responsible: Cathy Lewis (lewisc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As LCVS is striving to be a school of excellence, we want to implement the most effective and productive practices. Therefore, we want to continue and improve upon our PLC Plan and System (Essential Standards Development with Best Virtual Learning Practices) which will improve student achievement. LCVS 2022-2023 achievement scores were as follows: ELA = 58%, Math = 51%, Science = 47%, Social Studies = 63%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

1. ELA Achievement will increase 7 pts to 65%
2. Math Achievement will increase 9 pts to 60%
3. Science Achievement will increase 5 pts to 52%
4. Social Studies Achievement will increase 9 pts to 72%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor the progress towards the desired outcomes above through quarterly Student Data Chats with faculty and staff before PLT meetings. The data will drive the Essential Standards Focus and Best Practices action steps that derive from the PLT Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

When teachers are allowed the time, space, and information to determine the actual learning standards that students need to be taught and are encouraged to teach them through the best possible learning techniques and strategies, student achievement will take place.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"We must recognize that the system will never be systematic until teacher teams are clear on what each student must master." (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P. 84)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Relaunch LCVS PLC Plan and System; encourage each teacher to commit to the "#1 Thing" approach developed last year.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Attend monthly PLT Meetings and review/inspect subsequent documentation; ensure focus is appropriate and action steps are implemented.

Person Responsible: Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Conduct Quarterly Student Data Chats with faculty and staff; ensure focus is appropriate and actions steps are implemented.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Implement a K-5 Reading Initiative through the Sunshine State Young Readers Award Program. (SAC Funds may be utilized or Administrative Funds may be utilized to pay fees, etc.)

Person Responsible: Cathy Lewis (lewisc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a school, we are committed to the success of ALL students. Moreover, as a virtual school, we want to ensure a positive learning environment is provided to students who are falling behind pace, scoring low grades, or are not engaging within their virtual courses. Therefore, we must closely monitor progress and grades in courses to ensure striving students are identified and have the correct support (academic, mental health, computer/technical, etc.) that guide them to success. Based on last year's course withdrawal rates and graduation rates, we must utilize a process to improve our school. This process of monitoring and identification is know as the LCVS Triage Process (LCVS' "in-house" EWS). The goals of Triage are to help faculty and staff QUICKLY identify students who need support, ensure the support is collaboratively implemented with clear and positive communication, decrease the amount of "non-completing students" who are withdrawn passing (WP) or withdrawn failing (WF) (45% of withdraws were WP or WF), and improve our Graduation Rate (72% - estimated). We will also plan to celebrate students' achievements and excellence with graduation and celebration ceremonies with accompanying rewards and recognitions.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

1. We will Decrease our WP/WF's by 10% for the coming school year.
2. We will ensure 100% of Triage submissions have a resolution (with feedback provided to teachers) that leads students towards a successful outcome.
3. We will increase our graduation rate to 90%, an increase of 18 pts.
4. We will host ceremonies of celebration through out the year. (SAC Funds may be utilized to support)

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor the progress of this focus area by including Triage updates and reports as a consistent element of weekly Leadership Team meetings. We will ensure Triage submissions have a resolution on a weekly basis and also monitor WP/WF's with FLVS Franchise Reports. Senior Student Review meetings with school counselors happen on a monthly basis (Student Services PLT). The data gathered from these meetings will be utilized to monitor progress towards the goals listed above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Preventing and/or quickly addressing academic, mental health, or technical issues before they negatively impact students will greatly improve the LCVS learning environment and student success rates. The LCVS Triage Process will support all stakeholders in identifying students in need of supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"The best intervention is prevention." (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P. 90). In order to prevent withdrawals and non-graduates, we will implement the LCVS Triage Process described above. When students are identified, LCVS Faculty and staff will provide needed supports including: small-group instruction (EQUIP sessions), one-on-one instruction (in-person and virtual), MHL support, technical support, scheduling or course changes, Full Time or Home Education status changes, ELA and Math

Bootcamp inclusion, on-campus required work sessions, etc. (all as needed to positively support students in getting back on track towards successful completion).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Relaunch the LCVS Triage Process with faculty and staff; ensure that all stakeholders understand that the Triage Process is much more like throwing a life preserver to students rather than a punitive tool used on students who fall behind pace or grade expectations.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Ensure the Triage Process is carried out with accountability and effectiveness; ensure resolutions are found and communicated with all stakeholders; meet weekly with Triage Leader and Team to review students of concerns and resolutions.

Person Responsible: Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Conduct monthly faculty meetings that include time for Triage Team Follow-Up Meetings where faculty and meet with staff and Triage Team Members to discuss students of concern and resolutions.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Implement student success discussions ("What's Working For You?") in each PLT; allow each PLT to recognize and celebrate specific students who have performed well or overcame major obstacles at the end of the school year. (Funds for awards may come from SAC or Administrative Budget)

Person Responsible: Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of School Year

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our SWD subgroup scored below the 41% threshold in the 2021-2022 school year (actual overall score was 30%). Therefore, we will focus on providing intensive, virtual and in-person intervention and support for this subgroup in the coming year (SWD EQUIP Plan).

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

1. Our SWD subgroup will have an overall performance score of 50% or better (an improvement of 20 pts).

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team, along with the ESE PLT and Intervention Specialists (ELA and Math Coaches), will monitor improvements on PM1, PM2, LSA's, IEP Goals, and classroom performance (both pacing and grades).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Martin (martins1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Providing intensive, in-person intervention and support for this subgroup in the coming year (SWD EQUIP Plan)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Will vs. Skill: providing intensive, in-person intervention and support will allow our teams the opportunity to not only determine which Essential Standards needs to be addressed, but also more quickly determine if each students' learning deficit is a Will vs Skill issue. These two determinations will allow our interventions to be more targeted and effective. "Target the cause of the problem, not the symptom." (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P. 162)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Develop SWD EQUIP Plan and Calendar of Interventions

Person Responsible: Samantha Martin (martins1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

Conduct weekly Leadership Team Meetings to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Conduct monthly Faculty Meetings that include "students of concern" collaboration time.

Person Responsible: Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Conduct monthly ESE PLT Meeting to discuss students, interventions, goals, and time lines.

Person Responsible: Samantha Martin (martins1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Provide intensive, in-person intervention and support for SWD subgroup (SWD EQUIP Plan) on weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Samantha Martin (martins1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The LCVS Leadership Team, in conjunction with the LCVS SAC and District Leaders, will review and ensure that any school improvement funding allocations/resources are utilized to improve performance of our Students with Disabilities. Once informed of any funds availability, the LCVS Leadership will conduct a meeting with all stakeholders to determine needs for allocations/resources that will benefit SWD's in the best ways to ensure successful outcomes.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Kindergarten: 50% of the students are 1 grade level below in vocabulary and 25% of the students are two years below grade level in Phonics, PA, V, Comprehension, and HFW.

1st Grade: 50% of the students are one grade level below in Phonics and Phonemic Awareness and 25% of the students are two grades below in the same areas.

2nd Grade: 67% of the students are two grade levels below in Phonics and Phonemic Awareness as well as in the area of building vocabulary where 67% of the students are one grade level below in this category.

Specific Instructional Practice: LCVS Faculty and Staff will attend and support Elementary PLT planning and implementation of specific virtual as well as in-person Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, and Vocabulary Building lessons and tutoring sessions. These lessons and subsequent data from PM1 - PM2 will increase student learning in literacy.

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

3rd Grade: 58% of the students are one or two grade levels below in the category of Vocabulary and 29% of students are one or two grade levels below in Phonics.

4th Grade: 63% of the students are one or two grade levels below in the area of Vocabulary while 31% of the students are one grade level or more below in the area of Phonics.

5th Grade: 50% of the students are one or more grade levels below in the area of Vocabulary and 50% of the students are one or more grade levels below in the area of Comprehension.

Specific Instructional Practice: LCVS Faculty and Staff will attend and support Elementary PLT planning and implementation of specific virtual as well as in-person Phonics, Vocabulary Building, and Comprehension lessons and tutoring sessions. These lessons and subsequent data from PM1 - PM2 will increase student learning in literacy.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students one grade level below in Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, and Vocabulary will decrease by 15% by PM2; 25% by PM3.

The percentage of students two grade levels below in Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, and Vocabulary will decrease by 25% by PM2; 35% by PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students one grade level below in Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension will decrease by 15% by PM2; 25% by PM3.

The percentage of students two grade levels below in Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension will decrease by 25% by PM2; 35% by PM3.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor progress through PLT Documentation of lesson planning and implementation reports, MTSS student data reviews, iReady progress reports, PM1 - 3 Data, and specific teacher assessments (LSA's, DBA's, Exit Slip data from virtual and in-person lessons and tutoring sessions)

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Cathy, lewisc@lake.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

When teachers are allowed the time, space, and information (PLT Meetings where attendees grapple with the most recent student data) to determine the actual learning standards that students need to be taught and are encouraged to teach them through the best possible learning techniques and strategies, student achievement will take place.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Time, Space, and Information (Student Data):

"We must recognize that the system will never be systematic until teacher teams are clear on what each student must master." (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P. 84)

"We don't want to wait until the summative assessment to find out which students need more help...If we can predict what might challenge students, and proactively remove these obstacles, then more students feel immediate success and fewer need additional help." (Taking Action - Buffman, Mattos, & Malone. P.152)

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Assessment: Conduct PM1 Data Analysis Chat with Faculty and Staff before PLT Kick-Off Session (BOY, FAST, STAR) to develop overarching focus areas and discuss implementation of targeted instruction. Conduct PM2 Data Analysis Chat with Faculty and Staff before Semester 2 (BOY, FAST, STAR) to develop overarching focus areas and discuss implementation of targeted instruction.	King, Derrick, kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching: Conduct monthly PLT meetings to review student data and allow teachers to choose their "#1 Thing" to focus on during virtual and in-person lessons and tutoring sessions. MTSS Coaching Team will follow up with "Push-Ins" during in-person tutoring and instruction sessions held by instructors.	Miller, Paul, millerp@lake.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: Conduct on-going professional development regarding literacy development for elementary students. Ms. Lewis, LCVS' Lit. Coach, will conduct these sessions with our elementary teacher team during district provided PD days.	Lewis, Cathy, lewisc@lake.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
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 the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A - Not Title I

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 Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A - Not Title I

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 III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A - Not Title I

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 ESSA, 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). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A - Not Title I

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A - Not Title I

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A - Not Title I

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. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A - Not Title I

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A - Not Title I

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A - Not Title I

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				$3,894.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	5100	7004 - Lake Virtual Franchise	Other		$3,894.00
			Notes: SAI Funds			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
					Total:	$3,894.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No