

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bay Crest Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bay Crest Elementary School

4925 WEBB RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Maltezos

Start Date for this Principal: 4/1/2014

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bay Crest Elementary School

4925 WEBB RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

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 Hillsborough 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.

To provide a solid foundation that provides a culture for students to become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be an exemplary school for students and staff by setting high expectations for responsibility, achievement, and empathy.

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
Maltezos, Lisa	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
Falcone, Christina	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
Swanson, Linda	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 4/1/2014, Lisa Maltezos

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.*

3

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	110	108	72	108	132	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	10	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Wednesday 6/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	92	106	106	87	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	19	11	10	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	4	29	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	4	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	92	92	106	106	87	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	19	11	10	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	29	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	50%	52%	57%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	55%	58%	57%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	54%	63%	47%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	57%	62%	56%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	46%	51%	43%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	50%	53%	57%	48%	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	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
	2018	31%	57%	-26%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	60%	-33%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	51%	-20%	53%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
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
SWD	16	49	62	18	29	20					
ELL	38	63	69	34	43	32	12				
BLK	46	60		23	28		17				
HSP	45	63	73	40	46	32	28				
MUL	67			42							
WHT	57	38		51	50		48				
FRL	45	56	63	36	45	27	33				
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	15	37	42	27	46	50	24				
ELL	29	44	45	34	47	38	41				
BLK	34	35		17	25						
HSP	47	54	43	45	51	39	47				
MUL	54			54							
WHT	51	57		55	59	33	58				
FRL	43	53	44	42	50	35	44				
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	23	41	38	28	46	27	36				
ELL	36	59	62	31	63	43	55				
BLK	45	52		32	48						
HSP	50	59	52	44	60	45	58				
MUL	58			50							
WHT	57	54	64	57	52	30	71				
FRL	50	56	51	41	55	43	57				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
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	46
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.

5th Grade FSA math and 1st and 3rd grade Iready math data (diagnostic 2 in winter). Formative data supports the FSA data. Students demonstrate learning gaps within foundational skills which lead to high frustration level in the content areas. Students lack of stamina also contributed to low performance.

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

5th grade FSA math and 3rd grade IReady math. In both grade levels, a vast majority of students enter below level with the contributing factor being a lack of math foundational skills leading to frustration and lack of engagement.

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.

FSA math. 27% of students passed on 2019 FSA compared to 60% statewide. Students are consistently low performing due to a gap in foundation skills. A deficit in small group instruction and differentiation is also a factor.

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

1st grade ELA and 2nd grade math based on Fall 2019 Diagnostic 1 to Winter 2109 Diagnostic 2
Why? Collaborative planning, differentiation, instructional practices, guided groups, and academic coaches.

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

Students with disabilities and African American students (35% of our 41 students met the federal index)

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

1. Increase small group instruction and differentiation across all areas to close/prevent learning gaps
2. Purposeful planning based on standards
3. School Culture (Sanford Harmony/class meetings, CHAMPS/Relationship building)
4. Integration of all subject areas via STEAM implementation
5. RTI instruction focusing on both reading and math to bridge learning gaps

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on FSA and IReady data, math is a critical need area. Using strategies to increase student engagement will lead to closing and preventing learning gaps. Strategies will include collaborative planning, small group differentiated instruction, use of exit tickets, hands on (manipulatives) and critical thinking activities (H.O.T questions), and creating a positive classroom environment.

Measurable Outcome: Engagement will be measured during walk throughs with 80% or more of the students involved in active learning activities, 80% will participate in STEAM activities including building challenges. 80% of students will increase engagement through use of exit tickets. 80% of students will show gains based on data collected on Data Wall. 80% of classrooms will have implemented community building activities such as Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS, Morning Meetings, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To increase engagement and student community, we will utilize collaborative planning to include targeted small group/differentiated instruction with a focus on hands on and critical thinking activities, the use of exit tickets, and community building activities (Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS, Morning meetings, etc).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are utilizing these strategies to increase engagement and close/prevent the learning gaps, and increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide and participate in Professional Development focused on HOT questions and differentiation (Purchase: resource books & materials, presenter/trainer) and Sanford Harmony (materials, facilitator)
2. Provide and participate in Learning Walks on and off campus with classroom coverage (substitutes)
3. Provide additional resource staff to support planning, differentiation/small groups, and additional needs based grouping specifically for Black and students with disabilities.
4. Support student engagement and learning through STEAM implementation, and consumable resources to support all of the above

Person Responsible Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- Collaborative Planning
- Electronic Data Wall
- Targeted Professional Development
- Integration of content via STEAM
- Timely Professional Development (formerly new teacher meetings)

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.

We will build positive relationships with parents and families through our SAC meetings, PAC meetings to create positive interactions with our ELL families, educate and engage families in their student's learning through Parent and Family Involvement nights, data sharing conferences, and access to translation resources for our non-English speaking families. Community stakeholders will help fulfill the school mission through participation in our SAC committee.

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: Student Engagement				\$312,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0191 - Bay Crest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$190,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher salaries: Reading coach, reading resource, math coach</i>			
			0191 - Bay Crest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$45,000.00

			Notes: Salaries: Support Staff-ELP tutor for reading and math; Title 1 Para			
			0191 - Bay Crest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$75,000.00
			Notes: Technology-purchase of laptops/laptop carts			
			0191 - Bay Crest Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
			Notes: Professional Development- substitutes			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice:				\$0.00
					Total:	\$312,000.00