Hillsborough County Public Schools

Yates Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Varnum

Start Date for this Principal: 4/8/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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.](http://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

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[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 PK-5	Yes	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

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.

Encourage, Empower and Elevate Eaglets for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life. Our vision is for all staff and students to work together as a community to ensure success both academically as well as socially.

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
Varnum, Lisa	Principal	As principal, Ms. Varnum oversees the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. She also provides support through professional development, walk through feedback and side by side coaching to support teachers in their journey to provide quality instruction for all students.
VanBrunt, Colene	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Ms. Van Brunt assist the principal with the the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. She also provides support through professional development, walk through feedback and side by side coaching to support teachers in their journey to provide quality instruction for all students
Taylor, Ashlee	Instructional Coach	As our on site math coach, Ms. Taylor support the vision of the school by providing planning support, side by side coaching, and data chats with teachers. She also serves a vital role on the leadership team through data analysis of trends and areas of needs as she focus on supports where the needs arise.
Johnson, Danielle	Instructional Coach	As our on site reading coach, Ms. Johnson supports the vision of the school by providing planning support, side by side coaching, professional development and data chats with teachers. She also serves a vital role on the leadership team through data analysis of trends and areas of needs as she focus on supports where the needs arise.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/8/2019, Lisa Varnum

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.*

2

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	93	96	103	98	93	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	30	30	25	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	

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	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	9	22	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	62	46	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	3	1	16	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	112	108	127	118	95	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	26	17	15	11	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	62	46	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	1	20	18	0	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	1	3	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	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	43%	52%	57%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	56%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	54%	63%	47%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	46%	51%	50%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	50%	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	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	28%	54%	-26%	62%	-34%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	57%	-13%	64%	-20%
	2018	35%	57%	-22%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	7%					
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	11%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
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	32	61	75	27	68	73	42				
ELL	17	39	46	27	60	53	7				
BLK	33	43	33	33	57	69	36				
HSP	34	55	59	41	60	64	35				
MUL	29			29							
WHT	62	59	73	54	66	58	63				
FRL	40	48	49	42	58	58	42				
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	24	24	7	29	35	28	33				
ELL	24	40	46	33	47	43	33				
BLK	34	43	38	27	41	38	22				
HSP	36	42	32	44	49	48	45				
MUL	43	36		57	55						
WHT	50	42	17	46	43	17	48				
FRL	39	39	30	41	46	37	40				

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	18	44	50	28	38	29	33				
ELL	33	34		35	56	58	20				
BLK	36	52		29	52	45	33				
HSP	47	47	48	48	53	60	40				
MUL	47	62		56	58						
WHT	51	55	53	53	53	43	67				
FRL	45	52	60	45	52	52	48				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	43
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	53
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	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	62
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	51
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.

2019 FSA: The lowest performing cell on the 2019 FSA was ELA Achievement though this cell still represented a 2 percentage point increase as compared to 2018 (41-43)

Based on 19-20 district formative data, ELA has an overall lower prediction of proficiency (3rd 26%, 4th 28% 5th 45%)

Based on Winter iReady 19-20 the number of ELA students on or above grade level is high in reading compared to math (ELA On or Above 3rd 26%, 4th 19%, 5th 14% ---- Math 3rd 9%, 4th 6%, 5th 9%) however the number of students two or more grade levels below is lower in math as compared to reading.

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

2019 FSA: Gains were noted in ELA Achievement, Math Achievement and all areas of gains. The only data cell that did not make gains was 5th grade Science with a decrease of 46 to 44 points. Targeted focus was on the the core instruction for reading and math. This same level of targeted focus was not implemented in the area of Science.

19-20 Science formative data: Form 1, % of students scoring at 50% of higher 52%. Form 2, % of students scoring 50% or higher was 54%.

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.

2019 FSA: Math achievement in grades 3-5 was 44% compared to the state average of 62% creating a difference of 18%. While we are making upward tends a stronger focus has been on ELA the past few years.

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

FSA 2019: ELA bottom Quartile learning gains had an increase of 23 points with Math bottom Quartile learning gains at a 25 point increase. Targeted identification ans supports was an area of focus for the 18-19 school year.

19-20 Math Formative Data: 3rd grade math proficiency increased 26% from September 2019 to March 2020.

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

2019-2020 Attendance Data: 94 students were present less than 90% of the time. Additionally we averaged 60 students tardy per day. With COVID, attendance will be flexible for 20-21 however an increase focus on tardies is needed.

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

1. Reading Proficiency and Gains
2. Math Proficiency and Bottom Quartile
3. Decrease the number of student tardies.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve core and small group instructional practices through routine data analysis, planning and implementation supports. (planning for grade level core standards and small group needs in response to the data) with an intentional focus on our multiracial subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	3% or more growth will be seen in all areas (proficiency, gain, and BQ) by end of year district or State FSA assessment by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	On site, side by side coaching support meets the criteria for job embedded professional development to build teacher capacity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Significant gains were noted with intentional progress monitoring and planning for the bottom quartile. The implementation of these strategies with all students will positively increase students achievement across content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly time for data review and planning supported by the academic coaches and administration.

Person Responsible	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Grade level data chats after formative assessments to determine grade and class level trends and develop next steps. Data chats will also be used to progress monitor individual student progress to determine needed supports or enrichment.

Person Responsible	Colene VanBrunt (colene.vanbrunt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Fidelity of implementation for iReady and Achieve3000 (or SIPPS for K-2) across all grade levels with progress monitoring, small groups and individual student conferencing.

Person Responsible	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Implementation of action plan to address tardies school wide.

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.

Ongoing feedback is solicited throughout the year to various groups around many aspects that impact our way of work. Monthly sessions are held with strategic groups of teachers to analysis systems and structures and make recommended adjustments. Our new teachers also meet monthly to collaborate around successes and challenges to ensure a successful onboarding experience.
Our School Advisory Counsel and Parent Teacher Association meet regularly to maintain open dialog between the school and community at large. Our school has launched a strategic effort to increase relationships with community stakeholders as we work towards a common mission of supporting all 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: Small Group Instruction				$239,900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$66,000.00
		Notes: Reading Coach				
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$63,000.00
		Notes: Math Coach				
	5100	160-Other Support Personnel	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$15,000.00
		Notes: Part Time Daytime Tutor				
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$9,000.00
		Notes: Substitute teachers used to support planning, data chats, peer observations and other various activities to build teacher capacity.				
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,900.00

			Notes: Instructional materials to support teaching and learning: Patterns of Power, Greek and Latin Words, Vocabulary Ladder.			
	5100	510-Supplies	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Paper, pencils, toner etc to support instructional delivery			
	5100	649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$17,800.00
			Notes: 6 on stands for classroom use to support instructional delivery and engagement. 1 in conference room for grade level data dives, MTSS meetings, curriculum reviews, etc (7 Total)			
	5100	649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	4961 - Yates Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$62,200.00
			Notes: Intergration of technology across content areas through online instruction, research etc			
					Total:	**$239,900.00**