

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Monroe Middle Magnet 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	19

Monroe Middle Magnet School

4716 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Jahn

Start Date for this Principal: 2/14/2018

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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	19

Monroe Middle Magnet School

4716 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	80%
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.

Provide a collaborative culture that aims to develop internationally minded and compassionate life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower students with globally minded skills that allow them to create a positive impact throughout the world.

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
Fillhart, Barbara	Principal	Oversee school operations
Fletcher, David	Other	Success Coach
Rauld, Wendy	Assistant Principal	School oversight and assistant principal for curriculum
Fisher, Pat	Instructional Coach	Collaborates with teachers to administer reading curriculum support
Morgan, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with teachers to incorporate IB standards into daily lessons
Cantrell, Jason	Assistant Principal	School oversight and assistant principal
Micciche, Debra	Instructional Coach	Collaborates with teachers to administer math curriculum support
Waller, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Collaborates with teachers to administer writing curriculum support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/14/2018, Kimberly Jahn

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A

Support Tier	N/A
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	129	115	125	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	23	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	23	31	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	30	0	0	0	0	104

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	122	125	126	0	0	0	0	373	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
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	122	125	126	0	0	0	0	373	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
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	40%	51%	54%	37%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	52%	54%	46%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	47%	37%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	47%	55%	58%	41%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	57%	63%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	51%	53%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	47%	51%	36%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	67%	72%	61%	66%	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	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	54%	-9%	52%	-7%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	37%	53%	-16%	56%	-19%
	2018	30%	54%	-24%	58%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	32%	49%	-17%	55%	-23%
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	52%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	62%	-11%	54%	-3%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	29%	31%	-2%	46%	-17%
	2018	23%	29%	-6%	45%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	37%	47%	-10%	48%	-11%
	2018	29%	48%	-19%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	67%	-14%	71%	-18%
2018	52%	65%	-13%	71%	-19%
Compare		1%			
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	87%	63%	24%	61%	26%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	85%	63%	22%	62%	23%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	10	24	24	21	46	53	6	18			
ELL	22	37	35	40	57	50	29	50			
ASN	55	36		91	82						
BLK	24	34	37	26	44	52	15	44			
HSP	39	45	36	42	53	53	45	53	84		
MUL	61	40		57	48		54				
WHT	54	45	42	68	56	56	49	68	91		
FRL	34	39	38	41	50	51	31	51	84		
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	8	29	33	15	36	35	19	32			
ELL	23	43	46	23	49	36		50			
BLK	21	36	34	25	49	51	25	35			
HSP	37	46	39	48	56	38	42	65	73		
MUL	60	67		48	46			67			
WHT	50	51	62	58	57	35	44	72	71		
FRL	33	44	39	40	53	43	28	51	88		
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	13	21	15	17	45	41	22	41			
ELL	20	50		24	65	64					
BLK	21	41	38	22	53	47	15	47	77		
HSP	42	43	29	44	69	67	42	68	93		
MUL	58	54		58	73						
WHT	44	51	38	54	70	56	46	61	74		
FRL	31	43	34	34	60	53	27	54	74		

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	52
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	66
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	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	52
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	52
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	59
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	49
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.

Mathematics- Our sixth grade students performed the lowest. It is not a trend for our sixth grade students to score low because the data from the prior year shows substantial gains. There is a trend that our ESE students score lowest every year.

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

Learning gains in ELA (-5) Contributing factor was teacher vacancy for half of the 2018-19 school year

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.

Sixth grade mathematics shows the biggest gap between state average. Contributing factor was teacher vacancy for the entire 2018-19 school year

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

Seventh grade ELA showed the most improvement for 2018-19. All grade level teachers collaborated through team teaching for reading and writing and students were differentiated during writing conferences.

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

Learning gains decreased in both math (-2) and ELA (-5)

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

1. Teachers will incorporate critical thinking lessons to guide instruction for student learning and engagement
2. Teachers will align learning targets to the standards
3. Professional development for teacher planning and assessment
4. ESE and Black/African American students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent
5. ELL students will increase achievement scores from 40-50 percent

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase student engagement and lesson involvement by incorporating critical thinking strategies supported by technology.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL students will increase achievement scores from 40-50 percent ESE students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent Black/African American students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Critical thinking and STEAM activities will be integrated to better engage students to build stronger learning communities, maintain consistent student involvement and improve the overall learning experience
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of critical thinking and STEAM activities are a proven instructional strategy because students learn by doing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase technology implementation
2. Utilize teacher professional development
3. Increase three-way coach support via modeling, training and walk-through's

Person Responsible Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To promote higher order student thinking using standards based instruction
Measurable Outcome:	ELL students will increase achievement scores from 40-50 percent ESE students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent Black/African American students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will provide daily lesson objectives and activities based upon current instructional standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Decision is based upon prior year teacher input and value of standards based learning

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development
2. Walk-through's
3. Coaching support
4. Administrative support

Person Responsible Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Coaches will be able to help enhance teacher instructional and management skills by providing support and specific planning strategies through professional development

Measurable Outcome: ELL students will increase achievement scores from 40-50 percent
ESE students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent
Black/African American students will increase achievement scores by 5 percent

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development will offer the opportunity for leaders to coach, role model and expose teachers to new and improved instructional strategies, including critical thinking and STEAM designed lessons and reading/writing/math strategies and enhance teacher planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students benefit from well designed, pre-planned lessons utilizing proven instructional strategies

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development with coaches
2. Walkthroughs
3. Individual support with planning ideas
4. Team planning involvement

Person Responsible Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

Our objective is to work cooperatively with all stakeholders to build a positive culture. Our school will incorporate stakeholders by utilizing input and data from;

- Student government
 - PTSA/SAC members
 - Parent and Family Involvement barrier survey
 - ASQI survey results (parents/students/teachers/staff
- in order to stay true to our vision and mission statement.

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				\$80,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2362 - Monroe Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		\$80,200.00
			Notes: Success Coach- full time RTI Resource Teacher- part-time			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$134,200.11
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2362 - Monroe Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		\$134,200.11
			Notes: Reading Coach Math Coach			
Total:						\$216,400.11