Joseph Stilwell Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Joseph Stilwell Middle School

7840 BURMA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32221

http://www.duvalschools.org/stilwell

Demographics

Principal: Tamara Tushhoff

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
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 (46%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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

Joseph Stilwell Middle School

7840 BURMA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32221

http://www.duvalschools.org/stilwell

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)
Middle School 6-8	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	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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 add value to every cadet in a supportive environment that promotes academic excellence, in a standards based instructional setting that inspires leadership and strengthens physical, mental, social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To cultivate a lifelong growth mindset in every cadet that promotes value to self and society through demonstrating mastery in the core standards, self-discipline, and personal responsibility.

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
Tuschhoff, Tammy	Principal	Safety of all students and employees Instructional leader Student progression Culture and Climate Cultivate building leaders Build relationships with community stakeholders Manage $4 million operation
Fox, Tommy	Dean	
Errico, David	Assistant Principal	
Myers, Vontrena	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Tamara Tushhoff

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.*
1

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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 (46%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	220	262	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	23	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	35	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	85	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	81	0	0	0	0	141
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	67	0	0	0	0	107

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/13/2020

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	214	271	243	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	62	41	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	253	242	0	0	0	0	761
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	55	71	63	0	0	0	0	189

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	38	67	72	0	0	0	0	177

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	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	27
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	271	243	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	62	41	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	253	242	0	0	0	0	761
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	55	71	63	0	0	0	0	189

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	38	67	72	0	0	0	0	177

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	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	27
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	36%	43%	54%	34%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	49%	54%	47%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	47%	40%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	45%	49%	58%	46%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	43%	50%	57%	54%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	47%	51%	59%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	32%	44%	51%	50%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	68%	72%	58%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	33%	47%	-14%	54%	-21%
	2018	36%	44%	-8%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	33%	44%	-11%	52%	-19%
	2018	24%	41%	-17%	51%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	36%	49%	-13%	56%	-20%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	42%	51%	-9%	55%	-13%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	47%	-5%	54%	-12%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	15%	32%	-17%	46%	-31%
	2018	39%	31%	8%	45%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	20%	40%	-20%	48%	-28%
	2018	30%	44%	-14%	50%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	94%	67%	27%	67%	27%	
2018	97%	63%	34%	65%	32%	
Compare		-3%				
CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	62%	69%	-7%	71%	-9%	
2018	96%	84%	12%	71%	25%	
Compare		-34%				
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	85%	57%	28%	61%	24%	
2018	75%	61%	14%	62%	13%	
Compare		10%				
GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	92%	61%	31%	57%	35%	
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%	
Compare		-8%				

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	24	24	19	34	31	29	20	60			
ELL	18	38	41	44	55	57	8	45			
ASN	56	52		63	56						
BLK	29	39	33	34	36	37	22	64	76		
HSP	29	38	43	58	52	53	30	64	81		
MUL	39	47	30	36	32	36	53	53	90		
WHT	45	48	38	55	48	33	40	69	77		
FRL	32	39	32	41	41	39	27	60	79		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	49	36	43	53	47	50	75			
ELL	21	37	40	32	48	33					
ASN	52	60		61	55						
BLK	34	47	40	43	49	46	38	90	67		
HSP	34	54	56	53	58	48	48		94		
MUL	44	44		42	55						
WHT	43	48	41	57	53	54	60	100	80		
FRL	37	48	42	48	51	48	46	90	77		

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	7	25	30	17	46	54	28	25			
ELL	19	47		44	53						
ASN	48	59		74	61		67				
BLK	25	42	35	36	54	53	33	46	77		
HSP	32	44	39	56	62	70	30	82			
MUL	38	53		46	51		64	60			
WHT	44	52	50	52	53	73	72	65	65		
FRL	32	44	37	42	53	57	45	60	71		

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	44
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	19
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	47
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	50
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	41
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.

Science is our lowest performing achievement at 32%. One of two Comp Sci 3 teachers was out from Oct to Jan.

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

Civics went from 93% to 65%. This was largely due to the district strategy of placing lower level readers in Law Studies and not Civics with artificially boosted the Civics scores in 17-18. By 18-19, all those low readers were now taking Civics which dropped the scores.

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.

6th grade ELA is 21% lower that the state average proficiency.

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

No areas had improvement, however the area with the smallest drop was ELA proficiency, from 38%-36%. Fidelity with Achieve 3000 helped reduce the drop. We added more writing practice in 8th grade and our strongest ELA teachers are in the 8th grade.

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

High number of referrals and suspensions for black students.

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

1. Reading across the curriculum for every student in every class
2. LPQ gains in Reading and Math
3. Science proficiency
4. Referrals,suspensions, and campus safety
5. Build Teacher trust by providing timely, effective, specific feedback that appropriately aligns with Standards Walk-through Based data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Fewer than 50% of the classrooms at JSMAL showed standards aligned instruction, 56% aligned tasks, and 32% aligned assessments. When students and teachers were asked about the rigor experienced in the classroom in the 5 essentials survey, most replied the rigor was inadequate, indicating most of our students are not seeing the standard at at the appropriate ALD (Achievement level descriptor).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of standards aligned assessments by 18% (From 32% to 50%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Tuschhoff (tuschhofft@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Standards Walkthrough Tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned assessments at the appropriate achievement level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, our school needs to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate assessments, so they are prepared to face those designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Support PLC process with measurable improvement based on IR Action Plan/SIP (Evidence of improvement within SWT Qualtrics) - Admin
2) Provide teachers with feedback within 24 hours of observation using the SWT tool - Each Admin who completes the SWT Tool. If multiple observations done - Admin over that content will provide the feedback.
3) Participate in November standards-based reviews with Region Leadership - Principal
4) Reflection of Action Plan with SBIC - Admin and Dept Heads
5) Continued walkthroughs from admin team to identify school models created based on elements of SBIC - Admin

Person Responsible	Tammy Tuschhoff (tuschhofft@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In schools with a Supportive Environment, the school is safe, demanding, and supportive. In such schools: students feel safe in and around the school, they find teachers trust-worthy and responsive to their academic needs, all students value hard work, and teachers push all students toward high academic performance. The data from our 5 Essentials survey tell us this is a very weak area for us.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the number of referrals and suspensions in and out of school in half, especially with black students and students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tommy Fox (foxt1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Added a behavior interventionist with Title I funds to work with teachers and students to improve relations and de-escalate misbehavior. 2. Improving PBIS strategies to ensure our students receive more positive rewards and recognition than negative ones. 3. Continue with our book study "Power Struggles" on successful techniques for educators.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Most (1/3) of our referrals were 1.01, classroom disruptions. We have too many referrals that are happening as a result of ineffective classroom management or poor routines and rituals. If we can help teachers build more effective student relationships it would lead to more trust and fewer power struggles. Increasing positive interactions will reduce the negative ones. Having an experienced teacher as an interventionist will help improve this in the classroom at the lowest level. This early intervention at the scene will improve student - teacher relationships much quicker and reduce the number of students being sent to the Dean's office.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire behavior interventionist - Completed by T. Tuschhoff
2. Create PBIS team with leader - Completed by T. Tuschhoff and V. Myers
3. Start a school wide student council - Leader identified and ready to recruit and plan. N. Palomino
4. Review data (discipline and 5 Essentials) with staff and faculty - Completed on teams by T. Tuschhoff
5. Present PBIS plan to staff and faculty during Preplanning - N. Palomino
6. Book study on "Power Struggles" during planning and early dismissal). T. Tuschhoff

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Effective Leadership was our strongest measure in the 5 Essential Survey. However, our weakest dimension in this area was not reinforcing our vision in the classroom and not building trust with our teachers for improved standards based learning. The best way to do this is to provide accurate and timely feedback to teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	Track written feedback all admin provides to teachers based on SBW's. Our goal is to give written (minimum) and oral (optimal) feedback to each teacher within 24 hours.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Tuschhoff (tuschhofft@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In schools with Effective Leaders, principals and teachers work together to implement a shared vision. In such schools, people, programs, and resources are focused on a vision for sustained improvement. Leaders: practice shared leadership, set high goals for quality instruction, maintain mutually trusting and respectful relationships, support professional advancement for faculty and staff, and manage resources for sustained program improvement.
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.

A. Reading across every content area improvement - Ensure science, social studies and elective teachers and requiring students to read and comprehend content material. Avoid lectures and too much teacher talk. Deliver Corrective Reading as designed and with fidelity.
B. LPQ Gains in Reading and Math - Correct placement in intensive classes and frequent monitoring of those teachers and students.
C. Improving Science proficiency - Most highly effective science teachers are teaching Comp Sci 3. We also have highest performing 7th graders taking Comp Sci 3.

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.

Joseph Stilwell Military Academy of Leadership fosters a positive school culture primarily through the our military leadership courses. Military routines and rituals, physical fitness and rank structure promotes camaraderie and values system. We enhance this foundation by developing relationships with stakeholders, supporting agencies, and District service providers (SRO, Achievers for Life, and our Faith-based partners). The team continues to create opportunities for faculty/staff, students, parents/guardians, and stakeholders to actively participate in school-based initiatives that are aligned with the School's Mission and Vision. As a learning community, we highlight the talents of our Cadets, Faculty/Staff, and Stakeholders by supporting them as they work in various capacities throughout our School campus and within the Community to make our Mission and Vision a reality. During the upcoming school year we will continue to partner with and celebrate all branches of the Armed Forces and implement positive initiatives that ensure our Learning Community reflects a fulfilling environment for learning that cultivates sound leadership values and a positive culture. The team will continue the following Outreach Projects:
* Campus Beautification Project (Faith Based Partners)
* Meals for Needy Families (Faculty/Staff)
* Veteran Ceremonies (Leadership Teachers/Cadets)

We also plan to roll out a comprehensive PBIS plan which includes a student council, school store, restorative practices, cadet ranks, Principal's Leadership Coin that will be rich in rewarding and recognizing positive behaviors.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$292,619.89
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2191 - Joseph Stilwell Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$276,389.35
			Notes: 1- Social Studies position 2- Math positions 1- Science position 1 - ELA position			
	6400	110-Administrators	2191 - Joseph Stilwell Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$3,230.54

			Notes: Marzano's Coaching for Effective Classroom Instruction conference in Orlando Florida.			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	2191 - Joseph Stilwell Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$13,000.00
			Notes: Cost for substitutes, TDE and leave for 5 teachers.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**				**$67,229.62**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2191 - Joseph Stilwell Middle School	Title, I Part A		$55,577.62
			Notes: Behavior Interventionist			
	5100	150-Aides	2191 - Joseph Stilwell Middle School	Title, I Part A		$11,652.00
			Notes: PT Paraprofessional for Reading classroom			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$359,849.51**