

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School



2020-21 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
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School

450 NW 14TH STREET, Miami, FL 33136

<http://www.gibsoncharterschool.com/wp/>

Demographics

Principal: Yaneisy Abreu

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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

N/A

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

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School

450 NW 14TH STREET, Miami, FL 33136

<http://www.gibsoncharterschool.com/wp/>

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 KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

The mission of the Gibson Charter School is to prepare our students academically and socially, through STEAM and Socio-Emotional Learning for success in a 21st century global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of The Gibson Charter School is to provide an innovative and challenging curriculum in a safe learning environment. We will provide a unique school experience through small class sizes and the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. The school will also utilize parental and community involvement in order to support our students' academic endeavors that support 21st Century learning.

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
Abreu, Yaneisy	Principal	Oversee the daily operations of the school in a highly effective manner.
Abreu, Yaneisy	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in overseeing the daily operations of the school in a highly effective manner.
Fairley, Jamaal	Instructional Coach	Provide Instructional support for teachers and monitor fidelity of curricular programs and resources.
Rodriguez, Ailyn	Attendance/ Social Work	Provide counseling and social referrals, implements our school wide social emotional programs and oversees other campaigns, such as anti-bullying.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/15/2016, Yaneisy Abreu

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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 .	

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	14	21	19	27	26	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	6	4	6	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	7	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	4	4	5	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

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	23	19	24	31	20	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	2	3	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	4	6	3	14	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	23	19	24	31	20	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	2	3	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	4	6	3	14	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	48%	62%	57%	27%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	62%	58%	54%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	58%	53%	58%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	42%	69%	63%	19%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	66%	62%	31%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	55%	51%	18%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	55%	53%	9%	52%	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	24%	60%	-36%	58%	-34%
	2018	31%	61%	-30%	57%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	24%	67%	-43%	62%	-38%
	2018	47%	67%	-20%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	69%	-2%	64%	3%
	2018	19%	68%	-49%	62%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		48%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	33%	65%	-32%	60%	-27%
	2018	43%	66%	-23%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	53%	-20%	53%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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
ELL	38	42		38	42						
BLK	51	52		44	52		27				
HSP	40	53		35	47						
FRL	49	54	54	42	52	25	27				
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
ELL	50			40							
BLK	48	71		47	70		46				
HSP	54	83		46	67						
FRL	49	75	67	46	68	75	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
BLK	29	61	64	18	28	20	11				
HSP	21	33		23	42						
FRL	27	54	58	19	31	18	9				

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	46
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	
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	45
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
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.

Math Lowest 25%- The planned math instruction and interventions were partially implemented.

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

Math Lowest 25%- This group was a different student cohort from the previous year. Our data trends show that emphasis was placed on student mastery only. It is evident that students with achievement gaps were not strategically targeted.

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 Lowest 25%- The number of points for students to attain in order to earn learning gains were unrealistic and math interventions were only partially implemented.

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

ELA Achievement - Increased professional development, ongoing reading comprehension tests, and monthly growth monitoring assessments. The teacher admin data chats were also very beneficial in tracking and projecting student learning gain outcomes and mastery.

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

Truancy and course failures in math

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

1. Attendance
2. Math learning gains
3. Math achievement
4. Science Proficiency
5. Attaining Achievement Goals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The teacher retention rates at the school has been very poor. The teacher turnover trend has created instructional inconsistencies and gaps with students' learning capabilities.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, it is expected that 100% of hired staff is retained at the school as a result of receiving practical and ongoing support from the school's instructional coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jamaal Fairley (jfairley@gibsoncharterschool.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Development sessions and trainings, Weekly Planning Meetings, Bi-Weekly Data Chats, Ongoing Book Studies, Pull Out and Push in Interventions, assisting with assessing students in small groups, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers have expressed need of instructional support, to include lesson planning and appropriate pacing. Resources used are PlanBook, Observe4Success, Instructional Focus Calendars and other resources and program that support our curricular goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Creation of Instructional Focus Calendars

Person Responsible: Jamaal Fairley (jfairley@gibsoncharterschool.com)

Weekly Planning Meetings

Person Responsible: Jamaal Fairley (jfairley@gibsoncharterschool.com)

Data Chats

Person Responsible: Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus is essential and directly relates to student achievement. Research shows that students with truancy cases and other warning indicators create a negative impact on student achievement. Our student demographic is considered a transient one, thus making it a critical area of need.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, the school would like to decrease the number of students identified with one or more Early Warning Indicators by ten percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance tracking and truancy packets are initiated once the threshold is met, the admin team and instructional coach monitor grades periodically and implement interventions as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Monitoring daily/Weekly is attendance and grade reporting is crucial instead of waiting for the end of each quarter. Resources used are Gradebook, Iready, and concierge pad.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Check for excessive absences weekly

Person Responsible Ailyn Rodriguez (arodriguez@gibsoncharterschool.com)

2. Monitor grades on a weekly basis

Person Responsible Jamaal Fairley (jfairley@gibsoncharterschool.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school's leadership team continuously meets to address the needs of all learners and the community they live in. We will continue to support the teachers and purchase the resources necessary to ensure the students achieve their maximum potential.

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.

Theodore R. and Thelma A. Gibson Charter school values the importance of a positive school culture. Our school understands that it is imperative that we continue our relationship with community stakeholders. The learning conditions of the school provide an opportunity for all students to learn and achieve. We have created a safe and orderly environment to maximize the opportunities for learning in the classroom. Data is used to provide targeted instruction to all students. Data is also used to provide enrichment and reteach opportunities for students who may need additional help with academic content. The leadership team has clear and defined roles for partnering together to support student learning. The Curriculum Resource Teacher and Department Chairs provide assistance to our teachers. Gibson Charter School has a dynamic character value curriculum that supports values for our students and staff. We have generated an atmosphere of trust between our stakeholders. Our school works with many programs to help students achieve. We have a partnership with OYC (Overtown Youth Center), Urgent Inc., and Touching Miami with Love. Our board, and leadership team stays on top of the most current and educational trends. Our faculty and staff participates in ongoing professional development opportunities. This has a powerful impact on our school culture. We understand the importance of investing in our teachers. We also provide workshops for parents, and meetings to discuss ways to better support their children. Gibson Charter School partnered with local businesses (Mc Donald's, Pollo Tropical, Power Pizzeria, Love ULMTD) during the summer to provide hot meals to our families. Our school works with local churches and businesses to provide bookbags and supplies for all of our students each year. We have a partnership with the Culmer Community and Jackson Dade Head Start. Our role is to provide parents with educational resources for their children. We partner with them in workshops and transition days for their children to be exposed to Kindergarten. A positive school culture takes hard work and effort to construct. Gibson Charter School has partnerships with our stakeholders and work alongside of them in providing the best educational support for our students.

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: Instructional Coaching				\$55,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter	Title, I Part A		\$51,000.00
<i>Notes: Lissette Piloto, Instructional Coach</i>						

		120-Classroom Teachers	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter	Title, I Part A		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: Title I teacher supplements for 9 teachers in the amount of \$500 each.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$51,365.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter	Title, I Part A		\$50,000.00
			<i>Notes: Liliana Ruiz, Math Teacher</i>			
		239-Other	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter	Title, I Part A		\$1,365.00
			<i>Notes: The goal is to empower Parental and Family Engagement to minimize the number of students with Early Warning Indicators and to support our school wide achievement goals.</i>			
					Total:	\$106,865.00