Miramar High School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
family and community involvement
school improvement
ambitious
striving
teaching
achievement
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miramar High School

3601 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Maria Formoso

Start Date for this Principal: 9/16/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Miramar High School

3601 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

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)
High School 9-12	No	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Miramar High School will provide a strong foundation for students to reach their ultimate potential through comprehensive curricula, rigorous standards and comprehensive assessments. The educational standards at Miramar High School, home to the International Baccalaureate and Aviation Magnet Programs, will foster cultural awareness and understanding so that graduates will be compassionate and independent thinkers in an emerging global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Miramar High school is achieving excellence in education for 21st century learners through college and career readiness, while supporting social emotional needs.

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
Formoso, Maria	Principal	Oversees implementation of School Improvement Plan
Bergeron, Kaila	Assistant Principal	Oversees teachers that work with students with disabilities; ensures students receive the services they need
Fernandez, Jason	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair Drafts SIP
Francois, Alexander	Assistant Principal	Oversees social studies teachers that work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need
Murray, John	Assistant Principal	Oversees math teachers that work with students with disabilities on math skills; ensures students receive the services they need
Selvidge, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Oversees elective teachers that work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need; manages team that develops and implements school improvement plan
Winter, Shelly	Assistant Principal	Oversees English and reading teachers that work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/16/2014, Maria Formoso

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.*

7

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.*

54

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

98

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	549	520	515	2107
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	77	72	83	327
One or more suspensions	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	78	83	89	250
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	22	46	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	132	136	121	541
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	142	79	180	539

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	16	14	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632	572	611	706	2521
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	136	170	352	788
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	93	83	68	353
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	147	103	68	505
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	145	0	0	325

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	167	158	90	159	574

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	132	132
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	22	13	53

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632	572	611	706	2521
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	136	170	352	788
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	93	83	68	353
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	147	103	68	505
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	145	0	0	325

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	167	158	90	159	574

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	132	132
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	22	13	53

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	41%	57%	56%	39%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	52%	51%	41%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	42%	33%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	29%	51%	51%	34%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	44%	48%	35%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	43%	45%	29%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	50%	66%	68%	49%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	71%	73%	67%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	67%	-18%	67%	-18%
2018	42%	62%	-20%	65%	-23%
Compare		7%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	70%	-5%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	68%	-5%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	61%	-38%	61%	-38%
2018	29%	63%	-34%	62%	-33%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	56%	-27%	57%	-28%
2018	26%	51%	-25%	56%	-30%
Compare		3%			

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	19	36	25	24	23	23	14	47		92	51
ELL	34	43	33	28	42	42	40	42		86	73
ASN	93	71		83	47		95	90		100	85
BLK	36	43	39	25	30	23	45	65		94	82

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
HSP	48	54	55	35	39	40	56	66		97	82
MUL	82	55		33	50		91			87	100
WHT	54	57		46	69		42	79		100	75
FRL	38	45	42	27	34	25	47	64		94	81

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
SWD	26	39	32	26	27	19	27	44		69	45
ELL	21	48	44	33	50	40	48	28		89	66
ASN	88	85						77		97	87
BLK	40	45	40	26	26	25	37	63		92	79
HSP	55	48	43	40	41	31	71	70		93	90
MUL	63	50		27	40			80		100	77
WHT	68	38		62	36		64	77			
FRL	42	45	39	29	30	25	42	64		91	80

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
SWD	15	35	30	19	34	7	30	43		66	42
ELL	14	36	38	29	42		18	38		62	78
ASN	86	67		68	25		85	95		96	91
BLK	35	39	31	33	36	29	44	63		92	57
HSP	48	47	44	32	30	27	61	76		86	71
MUL	41	45		33	36			82		100	70
WHT	68	44		50	47		57	80		60	
FRL	36	40	32	33	35	31	47	62		90	58

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	51
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
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	
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	65
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	50
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.

Students in the lowest 25th percentile in math showed the lowest performance. These students struggle with math concepts and have consistently been level one students. In order to overcome their deficits, these students need intensive math support. We need to dedicate more staff and resources to these students in order for them to become proficient.

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

Students showed the greatest decline in ELA achievement. The year this data was gathered of the 10th grade ELA teachers left the school after the 1st semester. The teacher's classes were taught by an interim sub for the 2nd semester. The sub did not have the curricular background to adequately prepare students for the ELA FSA.

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.

Math achievement proficiency has the greatest gap when compared with the state average. Most of the students taking the EOC in algebra and geometry are students that struggle with math concepts and have consistently been level one or two students. In order to overcome their deficits, these students need intensive math support. We need to dedicate more staff and resources to these students in order for them to become proficient.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement. The science department has utilized literacy skills when teaching their curriculum. Teachers emphasize the importance of vocabulary mastery and promote the use of test taking strategies.

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

The number of level one students testing and their failure to meet with academic success when passing core classes contribute to our proficiency struggles.

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

1. Monitor student progress in core areas utilizing common formative assessments
2. Provide remediation for students that show deficiency on common formative assessments
3. Increase academic support for students in their ELA & math courses
4. Promote literacy as well as college and career readiness through elective courses
5. Ensure students are socially and emotionally supported to meet with academic success

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities struggle to synthesize information across multiple subjects, through various platforms. Additionally, they do not perform well on high stakes testing.
Measurable Outcome:	9th and 10th grade students with disabilities will demonstrate 41% proficiency in English/Language Arts and math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment administered in May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cristina Selvidge (cristina.selvidge@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to accommodate students with disabilities, we will attempt to break material down into smaller segments, in small group settings. We will utilize various instructional methods such as scaffolding and chunking to assist students in attaining master of previously taught material. Periodically students will be tested to assess their level of mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is based on data scores that reflect success of reinforcing material through small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be given a pre-assessment. That assessment will be used to identify the areas of weakness or greatest deficiency that need to be addressed. Students will sorted into small groups. Within those small groups students will be provided differentiated instruction by their support facilitators. Support facilitators will monitor student's progress on differentiated instructions through activities. Every eight weeks students we will give a post-test to refine instruction focus practices as needed.

Person Responsible	Kaila Bergeron (kaila.bergeron@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A majority of Miramar students struggle with literacy skills such as the identification of key ideas and details, integration of knowledge, analysis of craft and structure, utilization of proper grammar as well as correct usage of language and editing which are the five standards tested on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	9th and 10th grade students will demonstrate 45% proficiency in English/language Arts as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment administered in May of 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cristina Selvidge (cristina.selvidge@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard-based Instructional Focus Guides will be created that aligned to instruction to grade-level standards. Common formative assessments will be administered to monitor success of plan implementation. Remediation will be provided to target deficiency in students that lack proficiency in mastery of the standards..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is based on data scores that reflect success of curriculum alignment as well as the use of common formative assessments to monitor student mastery as a result of of curriculum alignment.

Action Steps to Implement

The English/Language Arts department head will create standard-based Instructional Focus Guides for grades 9-12 to ensure that classroom instruction is aligned to grade-level standards. English/Language Arts teachers will follow the grade-level Instructional Focus Guide which provides a thorough curriculum that closely aligns grade-level standards. A common formative assessment will be administered every six weeks to collect data to monitor student mastery of standards. Remediation will be provided for standards which students lack mastery.

Person Responsible	Shelly Winter (shelly.winter@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	3610	910-To General Fund	1751 - Miramar High School	School Improvement Funds		$300.00
		Notes: Will utilize funds for professional development as needed for teacher to meet student needs.				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$300.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	910-To General Fund	1751 - Miramar High School	School Improvement Funds		$300.00
		Notes: Will utilize funds for professional development for teachers as needed to meet student needs.				
					Total:	**$600.00**