Martin County School District

Stuart Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stuart Middle School

575 SE GEORGIA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sms

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	50%
2018-19 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (66%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Stuart Middle School

575 SE GEORGIA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sms

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	45%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

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 Martin 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.

Stuart Middle School, in partnership with our community, fosters a collaborative learning environment that engages all students through authentic learning experiences. Students are challenged and empowered to achieve their maximum potential and equipped with the skills and knowledge necessary to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stuart Middle School provides a collaborative learning community where students utilize the knowledge and skills required for solving real-world problems and creating authentic products.

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
Jarrett, Ebony	Principal	
Dawedeit, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Desreuisseau, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Flood, Simone	Teacher, K-12	
Pool, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Juanita	Teacher, K-12	
White, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	
Mariano, Valerie	Instructional Coach	
Martin, Brandt	Dean	
Mustafa, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	290	285	295	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	31	36	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	53	52	0	0	0	0	164

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	10	17	20	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
56

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 10/2/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	35	27	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	58	50	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	57	46	0	0	0	0	143
	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	10	36	24	0	0	0	0	70

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	31	35	27	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	58	50	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	57	46	0	0	0	0	143
	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	10	36	24	0	0	0	0	70

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	68%	62%	54%	68%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	54%	61%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	47%	45%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	74%	58%	73%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	68%	57%	74%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	55%	51%	62%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	64%	51%	64%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	87%	72%	85%	75%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	290 (0)	285 (0)	295 (0)	870 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (31)	31 (35)	36 (27)	95 (93)
One or more suspensions	6 (7)	3 (58)	6 (50)	15 (115)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	12 (10)	15 (8)	27 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	59 (40)	53 (57)	52 (46)	164 (143)

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
06	2019	66%	57%	9%	54%	12%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	53%	10%	52%	11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	57%	11%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	74%	62%	12%	56%	18%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	64%	-4%	55%	5%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	64%	60%	4%	54%	10%
	2018	72%	65%	7%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	72%	67%	5%	46%	26%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	45%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	58%	1%	48%	11%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	77%	19%	71%	25%
2018	89%	79%	10%	71%	18%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	75%	24%	61%	38%
2018	100%	70%	30%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%
2018	96%	61%	35%	56%	40%
Compare		4%			

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	28	48	50	36	37	27	21		23		
ELL	24	33	39	38	37	35					
ASN	87	40		80	60						
BLK	39	54	52	44	39	32	33				
HSP	57	50	30	67	53	39	53		47		
MUL	72	65		66	58	60	73		62		
WHT	74	68	63	78	66	47	67	95	72		
FRL	53	55	50	57	51	40	49		48		
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	27	43	37	44	59	50	24	59	21		
ELL	29	42	38	42	68	76	36				
ASN	67	67		80	87						
BLK	35	49	30	43	64	57	26	79			
HSP	63	56	47	69	72	54	57	83	46		
MUL	76	76	60	70	74		30	100			
WHT	69	64	50	79	79	64	68	90	57		

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
FRL	51	56	42	62	71	59	41	85	39		
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	30	39	26	38	54	45	29	64	21		
ELL	27	43	45	39	66	68	25	64			
ASN	92	77		100	82						
BLK	26	40	35	33	48	39	26	62			
HSP	57	50	42	62	70	63	43	82	31		
MUL	73	63	38	72	56		64	90	50		
WHT	75	66	49	79	79	70	72	88	45		
FRL	56	52	42	61	65	55	53	79	21		

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	63
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
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	50
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.

Our Students With Disabilities performed the lowest. Teachers and Facilitators lack the professional knowledge on how to co-teach to meet the needs of the students. In 2018-2019 teachers and facilitators received initial training from Fiddlers on the co-teaching model, but data has indicated that we teachers and facilitators need additional training.

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

7th Grade Math declining at -8% proficient. Teachers needed more professional development in differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Our Students With Disabilities performed the lowest. Teachers and Facilitators lack the professional knowledge on how to co-teach to meet the needs of the students. In 2018-2019 teachers and facilitators received initial training from Fiddlers on the co-teaching model, but data has indicated that we teachers and facilitators need additional training.

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

ELA 8th grade with a 9% proficiency growth.There was an increase in collaboration among grade levels with more support from the Literacy Coach. Administration and literacy coach implemented school based learning walks with feedback.

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

Any students upon receiving two or more indicators listed above is brought to the attention of the Leadership Team for MTSS to review and for creating intervention/strategies/plan. At that point, parents become a part of the process, if not already involved. The team is made up of our AP of Curriculum, Lori Desreuisseau, AP of Discipline, Charlie Moody, District MTSS Coach, Teri Stone, Dean, Brandt Martin, Interventionist, IPS Coach, Literacy Coach, and guidance counselors. Our assigned school psychologist as well as our District Social worker sometimes participate. This problem-solving team reviews records related to academic progress, attendance, and behavior. Teachers' Focus notes which include parent contact and classroom interventions are reviewed by the team. The MTSS Team documents information and brainstorms strategies and/or interventions to write an action plan. The team assigns individuals to monitor responses to the plan and to report results to the same team at the next meeting. The interventionist is monitoring certain students by meeting with them on a regular basis and communicating with teachers.
A Critical Thinking intervention course is being implemented for L1 Math students and L1/L2 (Low) for ELA students. This course is on an alternating day schedule of a 60 minute period throughout the year. If a student didn't need both Math and ELA intervention then he/she alternates with PE. This allows for an intervention to be provided, but students still have an elective throughout the year. Course Recovery for students who failed a course. Mentoring with AmeriCorps. Check In/Check Out

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

1. Increase Students with Disabilities Achievement.
2. Increase English Language Learners Achievement
3. Increase 7th Grade Math Proficiency
4. Address EWS data and decrease data
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Students with Disabilities Achievement on State Assessments
Rationale	Identified as an indicator by ESSA. SWD in ELA had only 28% proficiency on the FSA ELA State Assessment. SWD in Math had only 27% proficiency on the FSA Math State Assessment. SWD in Science had only 21% proficiency on the Science State Assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the FSA ELA, students with disabilities will increase their achievement to 45% proficient. On the FSA Math, students with disabilities will increase their achievement to 45% proficient. On the Science Assessment, students with disabilities will increase their achievement 45% proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	To close the achievement gap among our ESE students, we have utilized Project CRISS metacognitive strategies for each core content along with facilitator support in all tested core contents. In ELA we have implemented a tier 3 SPIRE class for our students that are still deficient in phonemic awareness. For Math and ELA tier 2 support we have implemented a Critical Thinking class that students attend on alternating days. We have continued with the use of Snap and Read and Co-writer for students who would benefit from this specific accommodation. Our grade-level content CLTs continue to meet twice a week, which includes the facilitator to unwrap standards, intentionally plan, create CFAs, administer CFAs and analyze data for reteaching and enrichment. The CLT also implements the problem-solving process for district assessments and data analysis. SMS is continuing the collaborative teaching model to support ESE students in general education classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Project CRISS has been recognized by the What Works Clearing House. The goal of critical thinking is to support all Level 1 and Low Level 2 students by providing additional foundation and grade-level support in their ELA class. Students who need both Math and ELA support, attend those classes on alternating days. Snap & Read and Co-Writer is an acceptable adaptive technology support. Collaborative Learning Teams designed and based on research from Solution Tree.
Action Step	
Description	1. Enroll students in Critical Thinking Course. 2. Design research based curriculum with support of literacy coach and District coach. 3. Train Teachers in Project CRISS with follow up Coaching. 4. Continue on the CLT cycle to meet the needs of all students. 5. Recommend students in the SMS intervention process when necessary.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Increase ELL Achievement on State Assessments
Rationale	Identified as an indicator by ESSA. ELL students in ELA had only 24% proficiency on the FSA ELA State Assessment. ELL students in Math had only 38% proficiency on the FSA Math State Assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the FSA ELA, English Language Learners will increase their achievement to 45% proficient. On the FSA Math, English Language Learners will increase their achievement to 45% proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and ELL Para are working with students to assist with core content instruction. Snap & Read has been implemented in all core content classes to provide students with access to the text in their native language and/or the ability to listen to the text in English depending on their proficiency level. Students are working on Imagine Learning weekly, receive a word to word dictionary and glossary. Additionally, students are receiving additional support in Critical Thinking Math and ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Snap & Read and Co-Writer is an acceptable adaptive technology support. Imagine Learning is the research and District supported ELL Curriculum.
Action Step	
Description	1. Enroll students in Imagine Learning and implement the program with fidelity. 2. Teach students how to use Snap & Read and Co-Writer. 3. ELL Para supports students. 4. Provide reading instruction in small groups in the Critical Thinking Reading Course. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Increase Math Proficiency on State Assessments
Rationale	6th grade math decreased 4% from 64% proficiency to 60% proficiency. 7th grade math decreased 8% from 72% proficiency to 64% proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase 6th grade math proficiency from 60% to 70% on the FSA State Assessment. To increase 7th grade math proficiency from 64% to 70% on the FSA State Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	In collaborative teams, teachers are unwrapping standards to ensure that they have a firm understanding of what students need to know and be able to do. The Math Instructional Team Leader along with support from the District Math coaches are ensuring implementation with fidelity of District frameworks. In addition, the CLT is disaggregating data from district quarterly assessments and school-based CFAs. Critical Thinking Tier 2 support in Math has been provided for our L1 students. The District Math coaches are working closely with those teachers to make sure that instruction is engaging and differentiated based on the needs of students. There is a focus on incorporating more hands-on learning. The goal is to make sure that students have a clearer understanding of the skills being taught as they practice them in multiple ways. Also, SMS is continuing after school tutoring with JBHS NHS students to provide additional math support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Project CRISS has been recognized by the What Works Clearing House. The goal of critical thinking is to support all Level 1 and Low Level 2 students by providing additional foundation and grade-level support in their ELA class. Students who need both Math and ELA support, attend those classes on alternating days. Snap & Read and Co-Writer is an acceptable adaptive technology support. Collaborative Learning Teams designed and based on research from Solution Tree.

Action Step	
Description	1. Enroll students in Critical Thinking Course. 2. Design research based curriculum with support of literacy coach and District coach. 3. Train Teachers in Project CRISS with follow up Coaching. 4. Continue on the CLT cycle to meet the needs of all students. 5. Recommend students in the SMS intervention process when necessary.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

SMS focuses increasing parent involvement to build a school culture and relationships. Primary parental involvement targets include the Parent, Teacher, Student Association (PTSA) and School Advisory

Council (SAC). The organizations offer opportunities for parents to volunteer, gain an understanding of school culture and the policies and procedures of the School Improvement Process. At SMS, parents also participate in fundraising projects that financially support our Positive Behavior Intervention/Support (PBIS) initiatives. The ROAR Card economy system is how students can earn rewards and redeem those ROAR cards in a variety of ways. This allows our school to give incentives for students who meet or exceed published School-Wide Expectations. Parents also volunteer at The Scholastic Book Fair, PBIS Sponsored Events, as well as support Band, Chorus, and Drama Events. We are always looking for ways to encourage parent involvement with their students in middle school years.

SMS focuses meeting the needs of our students socially and emotionally. The school has two guidance counselors, Heather Hazlett and Chris Ralph. They divide the student body into two groups. Each counselor supports and refers students to mental health counseling agencies in our area if needed. Mental health counseling is provided on-site through a partnership with Tykes and Teens and Helping People Succeed. We have partnered with the Boys and Girls Club (AmeriCorps) to provide positive mentoring for our at-risk students on campus. In addition, our IPS coach, Valerie Mariano, and our Intervention Teacher, Courtney Mustafa, work with specific students on interventions. They also assist teachers and facilitators in supporting students who are at-risk. To support the intervention needs of our students teachers are receiving trauma informed care professional development from our local Mental Health agency Tykes and Teens with strategies on how to make positive connects with all students.

SMS created an academic success class to meet needs of all students socially, emotionally, and academically. Every Tuesday, our entire student body is broken into small groups of 16 students or less. In these groups, students work with an administrator, guidance counselor, or coach. Through these small groups, students participate in restorative circles and other team building activities. This class is also designed to offer academic support and growth mindset strategies to help students be successful in their classes. These small groups focus on growth mindset, character development, and inclusivity.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Students with Disabilities Achievement on State Assessments				$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		120-Classroom Teachers	0021 - Stuart Middle School	Other		$1,500.00
			Notes: SAC funded the cost of the training materials for all 21 teachers to be trained in Project CRISS.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELL Achievement on State Assessments				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Proficiency on State Assessments				$650.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0021 - Stuart Middle School	Other		$650.00
			Notes: SAC funded a teacher to over see after school Math Tutoring.			
					Total:	$2,150.00