Florida School for the Deaf & the Blind

Blind High School (Fsdb) School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Blind High School (Fsdb)

207 SAN MARCO AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the FSDB County School Board on 10/27/2023.

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.

The mission of the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind is to utilize all available talent, energy, and resources to provide free appropriate public education for eligible sensory-impaired students of Florida. As a school of academic excellence, the school shall strive to provide students an opportunity to access education services in a caring, safe, unique learning environment to prepare them to be literate, employable, and independent lifelong learners. The school shall provide outreach services that include collaboration with district school boards and shall encourage input from students, staff, parents, and the community. As a diverse organization, the school shall foster respect and understanding for each individual.

Provide the school's vision statement.

FSDB will prepare each student for a lifetime of success.

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
Cosgrove, Justin	Assistant Principal	Academic leader for the Blind High School
Zuaro, Elisha	Reading Coach	Supports teachers in implementing the Reading and ELA curriculum and analyzing data to target instruction; provides coaching opportunities for teachers to support use of evidence based practices including tiered instruction and high leverage practices; works with students in push in and pull out models to provide additional support as needed
	Other	Mr. Crozier provides instruction and support services to students in Orientation and Mobility, as well as, all areas of the expanded core curriculum (ECC) for students with a visual impairment. Mr. Crozier is a veteran educator who serves as a mentor to students and staff members. He has experience as a school leader, instructional data coach, and his work with our Student Leadership Council is impactful. He brings knowledge of all facets of our many programs and departments on campus and represents the students' perspective as well given his collaborative work with staff members and students alike. His experiences make him a valuable member or the School Improvement Plan (SIP) team.
Alexander, Joseph	Instructional Coach	Supports teachers in implementing the math curriculum and analyzing data to target instruction; provides coaching opportunities for teachers to support use of evidence based practices including tiered instruction and high leverage practices; works with students in push in and pull out models to provide additional support as needed.
McCombs, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. McCombs is on the team in the capacity of PBIS coach for Blind High School. As the BHS PBiS coach her responsibilities include collaborating with staff and students to support implementing practices and strategies that teach students behavioral expectations, create a climate of respect, responsibility, and cooperation, and to work with staff/team members to organize ways of establishing staff and student buy-in.
Oberman, Connie	School Counselor	Provide direct and indirect services that support the safety, mental health, and well-being of all students. Academic advisement and planning, career guidance and postsecondary planning, responsive mental health counseling services, community partnerships, and support with the provision of resiliency education, civic and character education, and life skill education.
Mitchell, Lucy	Other	Assists in the admissions process with completing social histories of the incoming prospective student and family. Has an assigned caseload of IEP counseling students that provide IEP counseling and write social emotional goals for. Representative for the blind department on the MV team and assist

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		in completing the eligibility assessment and working with the homeless student population. Assist the advancement department in the Angel Tree project and complete the needs assessments for the program and collect/distribute gifts. Assist student PRN/as needed for counseling needs. Assist students with general social work needs, social security questions/applications, financial resource, mental health resources in their community. Assist student with basic food and hygiene needs at school. Support staff through trainings and presentations on department and services.

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.

Sub-SAC team (school level), District SAC team

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 BHS sub-SAC team will look at the SIP plan quarterly. Additionally the SIP is shared with stakeholders and any revisions made will be done in a collaborative manner.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: COMMENDABLE 2016-17: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	29	19	50	40	25	51	49		
ELA Learning Gains				49			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile							60		
Math Achievement*	7	12	38	19	24	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				41			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile							50		
Science Achievement*	33	22	64	58	20	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	41	66	56	31	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					24	44			
Graduation Rate	100	90	89	100	41	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	29	23	65	36	30	67	19		
ELP Progress			45						

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	90
Graduation Rate	100

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	32	Yes	2	

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	28	Yes	1	1
FRL	39	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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	50			

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	29			7			33	53		100	29	
SWD	29			7			33	53		29	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
BLK												
HSP	40			0				57			3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27			5			25	55			4	
FRL	29			5			24	49		28	6	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	40	49		19	41		58	56		100	36	
SWD	40	49		24	41		58	63		100	36	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	42	64		20	30							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42	56		33	60		72			100	29	
FRL	38	49		26	43		56	50		100	38	

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	49	67	60	35	49	50	63	68		91	19	
SWD	49	67	60	35	49	50	63	68		91	20	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				0								
HSP	50	60		36	55							
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	59	79		42	45					100	20	
FRL	50	71		32	50	50	75	69		88	27	

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	24%	15%	9%	50%	-26%
09	2023 - Spring	24%	15%	9%	48%	-24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	14%	-7%	50%	-43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	13%	-6%	48%	-41%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	31%	14%	17%	63%	-32%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	63%	-13%

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.

Algebra 1 EOC. 86% of students achieved Level 1. This is 14 points above the district percentage and 47 points lower than the state average. One factor that may have caused the drop was our inability to fill the vacant Algebra 1 position. We used a long-term sub. For the 23/24 school year, we were able to fill the position with a full-time teacher. Additionally, visually impaired students have additional struggles in math due to the visual nature of the subject. Teachers provide multiple ways for students to access the material. Also, due to the size of the school, grade cohorts vary and scores may vary from year to year.

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

Math scores showed a 30% drop. As stated in A1, the cohorts vary from year to year. With the addition of not having a filled one of our Algebra 1 positions, the scores may match up. The school now has filled the math teacher position.

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 had the largest gap. See A1 and A2 for explanations

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

There was not a growth point on the math or ELA assessments, however, the level 5 drop was .8% in ELA.

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

NA for BHS

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

1. Targeting students using data and MTSS process to start and track academic needs
2. Improving teacher processes involving MTSS
3. Continue building on a culture of student leadership through PBIS
4. Training Associate Teachers and Instructional Assistants to serve a more academic role in the classrooms.
5. Meeting with and using the academic specialists to assist and coach teacher priority needs

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

The students in Blind High School will have opportunities to participate in Resilience and Character Education lessons and events. This will be in conjunction with the school's PBIS initiative.

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

Students in Blind High School will have an opportunity to participate in a monthly PBIS event and/or learning opportunity at the school level. (12 total)

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

Attendance

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Cosgrove (cosgrovej@fsdbk12.org)

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.)

This is a tier one level intervention. Students on the Student Leadership Council will actively assist in the planning and execution of these events and learning opportunities.

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

Using the student leadership council will ensure buy-in from the student body.

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.

Monthly presentation to the student body related to the character/resiliency trait of the month.

Person Responsible: Justin Cosgrove (cosgrovej@fsdbk12.org)

By When: End of each month.

Student leadership council meets monthly.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: End of each month

PBIS Events to build school culture.

Person Responsible: Karen Kolkedy (kolkedyk@fsdbk12.org)

By When: End of each semester.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

For the 23/24 school year, Instructional Assistants and Associate Teachers will be provided professional development as it relates to classroom assistance and instruction. These will be done at least once per quarter.

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

100% of BHS support staff will have had the opportunities for professional development.

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

Meeting attendance and implementation of PD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Cosgrove (cosgrovej@fsdbk12.org)

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.)

Use of specialists and professionals within the school to provide best practice training in areas including: Specialized Instruction for the Visually Impaired, Technology, and other areas of needs assessment.

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

Our instructional assistants/associate teachers are important members of our school community. They assist teachers and staff, they also have to cover classes when teachers are absent and further assistance in instruction will empower them as educators.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

Using the MTSS process and communicating interventions amongst teachers and service providers. This will allow for more targeted and measurable intervention.

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

By the end of the 23/24 school year, all teachers and service providers will use the intervention form, as designed in Skyward, to track and implement appropriate student interventions recommended through the MTSS process

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

the MTSS team will monitor interventions and outcomes within the designated timeline for the intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Interventions will be appropriate and implemented based on student need. Interventions may be related but not limited to academics, attendance, behavior, and mental health.

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

Ensuring implementation of interventions through the MTSS process will provide a more targeted attempt at improving student performance. When staff is able to communicate this, they will be able to work collaboratively in the students' best interest.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 will use available funding to implement and use resources for school improvement.