

Alachua County Public Schools

Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.

802 NW SEMINARY AVE, Micanopy, FL 32667

<http://www.macschool.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Brenda Maynard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.

802 NW SEMINARY AVE, Micanopy, FL 32667

<http://www.macschool.us/>

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	17%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

Our mission, as stated in our contract with the School Board of Alachua County, is to provide elementary students with a community oriented educational environment that stimulates and motivates them. This environment is to be achieved by:

Providing a small student-staff ratio

Incorporating the Town of Micanopy as the classroom

Using a performance based curriculum with individual learning plans for every student

Involving parents and other family members in all aspects of their child's education

Provide the school's vision statement.

Micanopy Area Cooperative School envisions a school environment that facilitates learning gains for each student. MACS strives to cultivate leadership qualities, success, high achievement and cooperation among all students, families and school staff.

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
Maynard, Brenda	Principal	<p>All team members collaborate with classroom teachers and families to review specific student data, analyze problems, develop a plan and monitor implementation of interventions. The team collaborates in reviewing and re-evaluating the plan to ensure that the students' individual needs are met. Each member has a responsibility in the process. The classroom teacher collects and monitors Tier I data and implements Tier II interventions. The teacher uses the Tier I data to direct the instruction. The Title I teacher also implements Tier II interventions and supports in data collection and progress monitoring. The ESE teacher consults with classroom teachers and supports in data collection and progress monitoring of Tier III students. The principal oversees school-wide progress monitoring, ensures fidelity of implementation and provides supports where needed.</p>
McKee, Penny	Assistant Principal	<p>All team members collaborate with classroom teachers and families to review specific student data, analyze problems, develop a plan and monitor implementation of interventions. The team collaborates in reviewing and re-evaluating the plan to ensure that the students' individual needs are met. Each member has a responsibility in the process. The classroom teacher collects and monitors Tier I data and implements Tier II interventions. The teacher uses the Tier I data to direct the instruction. The Title I teacher also implements Tier II interventions and supports in data collection and progress monitoring. The ESE teacher consults with classroom teachers and supports in data collection and progress monitoring of Tier III students. The principal oversees school-wide progress monitoring, ensures fidelity of implementation and provides supports where needed.</p>
Coughlin, Kaylee	Teacher, K-12	Provide support to teachers and students
Mudra, Stacy	School Counselor	
Huddleston, Tonya	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Brenda Maynard

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	34	36	36	30	36	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	33	31	36	36	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

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

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	33	31	36	36	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

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

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	73%	59%	57%	71%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	57%	58%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	53%	46%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	60%	63%	78%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	61%	62%	72%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	51%	64%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%	71%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	57%	12%	58%	11%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	79%	55%	24%	56%	23%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
	2018	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	60%	3%	64%	-1%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
	2018	74%	61%	13%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	55%	19%	53%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	17			8							
MUL	73			91							
WHT	73	69	69	69	69	50	74				
FRL	59	64	60	59	62	27	71				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	83			75							
MUL	82			91							
WHT	71	58	38	75	68	67	62				
FRL	74	51		74	68	55	52				
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
MUL	90			90							
WHT	69	61		75	68	55	73				
FRL	62	61	46	70	64		62				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - 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	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

The lowest performing group for the 2018-2019 year was the SWD in the area of ELA Achievement.

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

The 4th grade same grade comparison showed the greatest decline.

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

The 4th grade group showed the greatest gap when compared to the state.

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

The area of science showed the greatest improvement. The school targeted science growth as part of its school improvement goals. Teachers planned interactive activities as well as adjusted their pacing guides to incorporate more content instruction.

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

Students with disabilities need to increase proficiency in reading and math.

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

1. Need to increase proficiency of Students with Disabilities subgroup in the areas of reading and math proficiency by 35%.
2. Need to increase Math Lowest 25th quartile from 47% to 67%.
3. Economically disadvantaged students will improve proficiency from 40% to 65%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will focus on improved differentiation to target growth for students with disabilities and students in the lowest quartile. In 2018-2019 47% of the students in the lowest quartile were proficient in MATH and 8% of students with disabilities were proficient in Math.

Measurable Outcome: With targeted instruction provided by ESE teacher and Title 1 supplemental supports, proficiency scores will increase to at least 65% for the LQ subgroup, including students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brenda Maynard (maynardb@macschool.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Identified students will participate in research based intervention provided by a highly qualified teacher. Regular progress monitoring will occur to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention and the student learning growth. iReady growth assessment data and diagnostic assessment data will be used to direct differentiated instruction. Students will work to meet their "stretch" goal calculated through the iReady. Students will maintain data notebooks to monitor their progress toward their learning goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing targeted, explicit instruction based on formative assessment data is a research based, high effect strategy. According to John Hattie's high effect strategy research, providing feedback to students and setting appropriately challenging goals are among the strategies for having significant impact on accelerating student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will participate in iReady diagnostic assessment and growth checks. Teacher will conference with students, helping them to set goals and to monitor their progress towards their goal. Teacher will provide differentiated instruction based on the data for each subgroup.

Person Responsible: Kaylee Coughlin (coughlink@macschool.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Students will participate in progress monitoring assessments monthly to evaluate their school. The school leadership team will meet with the classroom teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction and or supports that will meet the students' growth needs.

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.

The school hosts a variety of family and community engagement activities throughout the school year. These events are held during the school day, evenings and on weekends. Annually, the school hosts a Community Day, inviting interested community stakeholders for a brunch and a student tour of the campus and associated activities. The school has an active presence at the Annual Fall Festival in Micanopy. The school hosts talent shows, student performances, fun runs, pancake breakfasts and other engagement activities. The school invites local law enforcement and first responders to come for lunch whenever they are in the area. Teachers plan walking field trips to nearby educational sites such as the Micanopy Library, the Post Office, the Fire Department and the local museums. We invite town representatives to come and speak to our students as applicable. Family and community members are invited to participate in our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and our Board Advisory Committee (BAC). Input is gathered and incorporated into the planning of our school improvement. All previous events are being evaluated and planned for the 2020-2021 school year with modifications due to COVID-19.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$59,308.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$43,609.28
			<i>Notes: Supplemental Personnel</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Ready Florida workbooks</i>			

	5100		0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.32
			<i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A		\$3,958.00
			<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 Web-based program</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math web-based program</i>			
	6400		0951 - Micanopy Area Cooperative School, Inc.	Title, I Part A		\$3,644.80
			<i>Notes: Faculty Book Study PLC</i>			
					Total:	\$59,308.40