

Leon County Schools

Leon County Virtual School Franchise School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	17

Leon County Virtual School Franchise

283 TROJAN TRAIL, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<http://www.leongoesvirtual.net>

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.

Leon County Virtual School's mission is to foster a virtual learning environment that meets the needs of the individual family while upholding academic integrity and promoting instructional innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mirrors Leon County Schools vision statement

Leon County Virtual School will be an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

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
Ricardo, Jennifer	Principal	
Bradley, Nikki	Assistant Principal	

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 uses a School Advisory Council to fulfill these requirement. All required stakeholders are represented (school leadership, teachers, staff, parents, students and businesses). SAC meetings are held 4 times per year and the purpose is to assist in making decisions about the mission and educational purpose and goals of the school.

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))

LCVS holds monthly meetings with all teachers to assess student performance and progress toward meeting the schoolwide goals of the SIP. After review of the student performance data, if needed, adjustments are made to the plan to ensure continuous improvement and learning for all students. These adjustments are brought to the SAC committee for approval.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	11%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: I 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	1	3	0	1	1	1	3	2	12	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	
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	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	1	0	2	1	4

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	5	4	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	1	1	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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	0	0	0	0	

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

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39			77			91		
ELA Learning Gains	53			56			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38			50					
Math Achievement*	27			61			76		
Math Learning Gains	41			46			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44			40					
Science Achievement*	37			81			90		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	37			89					
Middle School Acceleration	30			58					
Graduation Rate	100			100			100		
College and Career Acceleration	67			56			44		
ELP Progress									

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	61
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	18	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			

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%
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	57			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL				

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)

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	39	53	38	27	41	44	37	37	30	100	67	
SWD	12	27		5	27							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90											
BLK	47	50	36	21	34		30	62				
HSP	72	54		63	38							
MUL	80			50								
PAC												
WHT	72	47		45	56		58	73		100	70	
FRL												

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	77	56	50	61	46	40	81	89	58	100	56	
SWD												
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	50		27	20							
HSP	73											
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	51		72	53		84	93		100	62	
FRL												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	91	75		76	71		90			100	44	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88	79		90						100	50	
FRL												

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance on the 22-23 statewide assessment was Math proficiency. 51% of the students who took the math state assessment were proficient. Factors contributing to this performance was the influx of new elementary students, low attendance at Zoom sessions and teacher capacity.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was College and Career Acceleration (from 67 to 51) and Graduation Rate (from 100% to 84%). This decline is due in part to teacher capacity. Improvement is needed in this area.

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.

LCVS did not have any components lower than the state average.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Reading proficiency. This component increased from 64% proficiency to 70% proficiency. The implementation and fidelity of the MTSS process was a contributing factor to the improvement in this area.

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

Based on EWS data, a potential area of concern is absences. 12 students had below 90% attendance rate.

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

The highest priorities for Leon County Virtual School are:

1. Math proficiency
2. College and Career Acceleration
3. Graduation Rate

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

According to 2021-2022 Accountability Components by Subgroups, 21.4% of African American students scored at the proficiency level in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for 2023-2024 is that 50% of African American students will demonstrate proficiency in Math on the state's progress monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through monthly data chats using PM1, PM2 and teacher classroom assessments to determine progress in areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Bradley (bradley@leonschools.net)

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.)

Evidenced based interventions will be provided through I-Ready toolkit.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective and Highly Effective teachers understanding of effective evidence-based practices is vital for support student achievement and growth in learning. While many alternative pathways exist, teachers know what standards they must teach to address and improve student achievement. Their usage of the i-Ready tool kit will provide students with extra support needed.

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.

Teachers will participate in professional development to address the use of the i-Ready toolkit, areas of deficiencies, teaching strategies in the virtual world, and student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ricardo (ricardoj@leonschools.net)

By When: March 2024

#2. 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.

According to 2021-2022 Accountability Components by Subgroups, 5.3% of SWD students scored at the proficiency level in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for 2023-2024 is that 41% of SWD students will demonstrate proficiency in Math on the state's progress monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through monthly data chats using PM1, PM2, and teacher classroom assessments to determine progress in area of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ricardo (ricardoj@leonschools.net)

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.)

Evidence based intervention will be the use of i-Ready toolkit, along with guided instruction from ESE specialist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective and Highly Effective teachers understanding of effective evidence-based practices is vital for support of student achievement and growth in learning. While many alternative pathways exist, teacher support will ensure that standards are being presented to address and improve student achievement. Their usage of the i-Ready Toolkit, along with ESE support, will provide students with extra support needed.

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.

Teachers will participate in professional development to address the use of the i-Ready toolkit, areas of deficiencies, teaching strategies in the virtual world, and student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ricardo (ricardoj@leonschools.net)

By When: March 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

This area of focus is mandated by the state. The state of Florida, across the board is experiencing a crucial teacher shortage.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the 2022-2023 climate survey results, several teachers did not participate or left answers blank. Approximately 16% of each response was not completed. During the 2023-224 Climate Survey, 100% of teachers and staff will participate.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by the results of the participation percentage in the Climate Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ricardo (ricardoj@leonschools.net)

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.)

Evidence-based intervention will be to hold monthly faculty meetings, and quarterly in-person activities for staff and teachers to participate in.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the virtual world, it is important to connect with others. By having staff and teachers meeting in person, better connections will be made in order to improve staff morale, retention and recruitment.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Scheduling of monthly and quarterly meetings

Person Responsible: Nikki Bradley (bradley@leonschools.net)

By When: Schedule will be made by September 2023.

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 School advisory council will review and approve the allocation and expenditures of school improvement funds.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American					\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			7004 - Leon County Virtual School Franchise				\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development for Math teachers in virtual education</i>				
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	5100	5100	7004 - Leon County Virtual School Franchise	School Improvement Funds			\$800.00
			<i>Notes: Staff development for SWD teachers in I-Ready toolkit</i>				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment					\$0.00
						Total:	\$800.00

Budget Approval

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

No