

Brevard Public Schools

Gemini Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Gemini Elementary School

2100 OAK ST, Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

<http://www.gemini.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Christina Carver T

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (72%) 2014-15: A (81%)
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	N/A
* 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 Brevard 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Gemini Elementary School

2100 OAK ST, Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

<http://www.gemini.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	18%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Our mission is to serve each student with high levels of support and provide opportunities to develop to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to have a culture of dedication, collaboration, and lifelong learning to serve all Gemini students by maximizing their potential and empowering them with the essential skills to learn, work, and succeed in the 21st century.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crissey-Akil, Natasha	Instructional Coach	<p>Serve as School Advisory Co-Chair for SIP design and analysis</p> <p>Design agendas and guide monthly Instructional Planning for Student Growth (IPSG) Meetings</p> <p>Complete the Coaching Cycle and model standards-aligned instructional techniques</p> <p>Use iReady student data for goal setting and on-going progress monitoring</p> <p>Serve on the Individual Problem-Solving Team (IPST) to design student specific interventions based on the problem-solving model (academic and behavior)</p>
Julian, Jennifer	Principal	<p>Design master schedules to provide school-wide intervention and collaborative planning time</p> <p>Attend monthly IPSG grade level meetings to ensure standards-aligned lesson design based on student data</p> <p>Budget and allocate funds to support standards-aligned teacher/student materials and resources</p> <p>Collaborate with Parent Teacher Organization to develop fundraising opportunities to maintain funding</p> <p>Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices</p>
O'Brien, Erin	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serve as School Advisory Co-Chair for SIP design and analysis</p> <p>Attend national math conference and train teachers on best practices in math acquisition</p> <p>Serve as school math curriculum leadership team to guide teachers through mathematical practices and lesson design</p>
Burns, Carol	Assistant Principal	<p>Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices</p> <p>Serve on the Individual Problem-Solving Team (IPST) to design student specific interventions based on the problem-solving model (academic and behavior)</p> <p>Provide curriculum updates and resources based on district pacing and sequence guides</p>

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	65	58	71	59	67	85	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	27	13	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on FCAT Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	15	10	24	12	14	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	

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	83%	62%	57%	83%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	62%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	63%	63%	84%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	65%	62%	70%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	53%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	57%	53%	82%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	65 (0)	58 (0)	71 (0)	59 (0)	67 (0)	85 (0)	65 (0)	470 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 (0)	12 (0)	27 (0)	13 (0)	18 (0)	22 (0)	24 (0)	133 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on FSA ELA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on FCAT Science	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	91%	64%	27%	58%	33%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	57%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	61%	23%	58%	26%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	77%	60%	17%	54%	23%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	81%	60%	21%	60%	21%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	90%	67%	23%	55%	35%
	2018	100%	68%	32%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	56%	17%	53%	20%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	63	61	57	71	67	65					
HSP	100	50		82	60						
WHT	82	69	65	87	81	70	74				
FRL	81	67	92	83	74	57	79				
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	49	38	43	63	42	40	31				
HSP	100			100							
MUL	77	80		77	50						
WHT	80	60	51	82	62	48	67				
FRL	70	69	61	70	55	40	50				
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	48	47	44	43	53	52					
MUL	86	67		93	67						
WHT	82	62	53	83	70	58	80				
FRL	67	57	43	68	56	53					

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	530
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	76
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 data component showing the lowest performance on the FSA ELA is the subgroup, Lowest 25%. In 2018, 54% of our Lowest 25% made gains. In 2019, 65% of students in the Lowest 25%, again, made gains. This increase of 11% continues the upward trend that began in 2017. We believe the school wide focus on text-based writing, FSA aligned rubrics and impartial scoring of two practice assessments led to this increase for all of Gemini in 2019.

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

Gemini reports no declines from the prior year.

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.

In evaluating the Learning Gains for ELA, Gemini showed only a 10 point gain over the state gain. We see a trend in our data starting when text-based writing is assessed. Our school, in entirety, created cohesive language and assessments for writing, beginning in kindergarten and continuing throughout sixth grade. School wide vertical curriculum team meetings were held monthly to problem solve and discuss common formative assessments.

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

The data component showing the most improved performance was on the FSA Math, in the Lowest 25% subgroup. In 2018, 49% of our Lowest 25% made gains. In 2019, 71% of students in the Lowest 25% made gains. This is an increase of 22%. We believe the school wide focus on understanding math question types and increasing mathematical discourse between students led to this increase for all of Gemini in 2019. Teachers met with our Instructional coach to discuss the curriculum map and create an alignment between grades 4,5 and 6. This increased the depth of understanding of the mathematical standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The EWS indicates 28% of our students has attendance below 90%. This is consistent across grade levels.

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

1. Continue to focus on ELA text-based writing instruction and practice assessments
2. Grow the conceptual foundation of mathematical practice through mathematical discourse, purposeful questioning, use of evidence, building procedural fluency, and supporting productive struggle.
3. Increasing our depth of understanding of content specific mathematical standards by collaboratively planning lessons that focus on the full intent of the standard and mapping out learning targets.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Text-Based Writing Instruction
Rationale	Results on the FSA ELA Text-based writing domain for 2019 compute to a mean of 6.07, for grades 4-6. This is an increase from the previous year, but signifies an opportunity for growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our desired outcome for the 2020 FSA ELA text-based writing domain is 6.5-7.0 out of a possible total of ten. We will also complete two practice writing assessments for K-6. By the second assessment, we will be looking for an average of 6.5-7.0 out of a total of ten.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Timely feedback providing one on one student conferences leading to meaningful opportunities for growth is our evidence-based strategy taken from the work of Grant Wiggins.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>One on one student conferences with instructors will provide individualized reinforcement or enrichment of writing skills based on student friendly rubrics. Students, then, will be able to effectively goal set and describe how to reach their personal goals.</p> <p>The use of Write Score, provides a wealth of text-based lessons, designed to target specific need areas identified from formative assessments and allows for interrater reliability of scoring.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Writing rubrics with K-6 teachers 2. Identify grade level strengths and weaknesses to inform teaching 3. Apply first formative assessment in November 2019 4. Results reviewed by grade levels during Instructional Planning for Student Growth meetings 5. Teachers conference with individual students for strengths and opportunities for growth and set future writing goals in specific domains 6. Grades 4-6 will take their second formative writing assessment in February, and spend March and April fine tuning their areas of need. Teachers will continue to apply evidence based strategies to their teaching. 7. K-3 will take their second formative assessment in April, and spend the rest of the year conferencing with students to fine tune writing and continue to apply systematic evidence based strategies. 8. Administrative team reviews FSA data in July 2020.
Person Responsible	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Focus on Standards Based Instruction in Mathematics
Rationale	At Gemini, we want to offer high quality, common formative and summative assessments that align to our standards and lead to intentional planning based on data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For grades K-2, the measure indicating achievement will be our i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments. Specifically, the measurement value will be a score of 70% or higher. In addition, the Lowest 25% in all grade levels will show an increase on their i-Ready growth monitoring assessments. FSA learning gains for our lowest 25%, are currently at 71% and we are looking for an to increase to 76%. We expect Learning Gains for grades 4-6 to increase from 81% to 86% for 2020 FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy used will be standards based planning. This is based on Robert Marzano's The Essential Model for Achieving Rigor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The strategy of standards-based planning will help teachers develop criteria for success aligned to standards, create standards-based instruction in their classrooms, and set conditions for student success.</p> <p>Standard-based planning will influence all the other components of standards based instruction. Planning lessons and units that are built on instructional standards and standard-aligned assessments is the imperative first step for teachers. (Marzano article)</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curriculum Leadership teams (with instructional coach)will support implementation through their monthly Instructional Planning for Student Growth meetings to review and map math standards in grade level teams. 2. Grade level representatives will share and explain ideas and thoughts presented in Curriculum Leadership teams. 3. I-Ready MAFS training on September 11, 2019 (2 hours) for all staff (K-4) 4. Collaborative grade level planning targeting a standard per nine weeks in which staff will create assessment items, activities and tasks that meet the rigor and complexity. 5. Grade levels will meet to discuss progress of instruction based on formative classroom assessments. 6. Leadership Team walk-throughs /feedback using the IPG tool. 7. Instructional Coaching cycle will be an on-going process.
Person Responsible	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Text-Based Writing Instruction				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1140	7100-GRANTS & DONATIONS U.S.- CONTINUED	6101 - Gemini Elementary School	Other	470.0	\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Gemini PTO provided funding for Write Score for the 2019-2020 school year.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Focus on Standards Based Instruction in Mathematics				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		7000-GRANTS AND DONATIONS U.S.	6101 - Gemini Elementary School	Other	470.0	\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: PTO paid for Ready MAFS consumable workbooks</i>			
Total:						\$8,000.00