

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Stewart 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Stewart Middle Magnet School

1125 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Baretta Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Stewart Middle Magnet School

1125 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[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	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

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

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.

Stewart Middle Magnet School is a nationally recognized NASA Explorer School focusing on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education. "Going Above and Beyond" signifies our commitment to excellence and rigor. In partnership with our parents, community and teachers, we develop independent learners and creative problem solvers ready to address the challenges of the 21st century global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing independent life-time learners through explorations in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education.

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
Weiss, Susan	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's at Stewart Middle Magnet are: Observations of Faculty and staff, including all support and non-instructional personnel, Curriculum planning and development, Discipline, Safety & Mental Health Plan, Attendance, ESE/504 information assistance, Creating a Master schedule that incorporates all stakeholders, Building Maintenance, Athletics, Creating a school culture depicting a global school family, Transportation, Data Collection and Communication. Sub-system, Testing, and inspiring all stakeholders to become the best they can be.
Wilson, Baretta	Principal	
Baez, Arielle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Baretta Wilson

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.*

5

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	332	297	314	0	0	0	0	943	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	18	0	0	0	0	53	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	0	0	67	40	64	0	0	0	0	171	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	58	68	0	0	0	0	204	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	28	39	43	0	0	0	0	110	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	14	0	0	0	0	30	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	35	33	0	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	152	124	111	0	0	0	0	0	387	

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	28	39	43	0	0	0	0	110	

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	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	25	0	0	0	0	59

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	28	39	43	0	0	0	0	110
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	14	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	35	33	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	152	124	111	0	0	0	0	0	387

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	28	39	43	0	0	0	0	110

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	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	25	0	0	0	0	59

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	62%	51%	54%	56%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	47%	44%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	55%	58%	58%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	57%	55%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	40%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	58%	47%	51%	48%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	67%	72%	75%	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	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	54%	8%	52%	10%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	64%	53%	11%	56%	8%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	49%	-6%	55%	-12%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	62%	6%	54%	14%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		31%				
08	2019	26%	31%	-5%	46%	-20%
	2018	24%	29%	-5%	45%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	58%	47%	11%	48%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	48%	5%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
2018	78%	65%	13%	71%	7%
Compare		-8%			
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
2018	91%	63%	28%	62%	29%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	57%	37%	57%	37%
2018	96%	56%	40%	56%	40%
Compare		-2%			

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	23	36	29	23	39	33	19	34			
ELL	42	50	41	44	53	50	39	45	75		

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
ASN	96	79		92	79		93		84		
BLK	42	51	39	43	51	38	32	55	72		
HSP	64	59	49	63	57	51	59	72	81		
MUL	81	62		80	63		73	76	84		
WHT	81	68	47	84	71	48	83	93	95		
FRL	53	54	42	52	54	41	48	64	76		
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	19	25	11	21	36	33	24	54			
ELL	30	45	34	31	50	54	27	74	69		
ASN	97	72		97	86			92	94		
BLK	35	43	38	39	46	38	30	61	80		
HSP	58	54	45	64	64	53	55	79	87		
MUL	82	69		88	75		70	93	87		
WHT	80	69	29	84	69	59	75	93	95		
FRL	50	51	41	54	55	45	44	72	86		
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	24	33	24	25	35	27	22	30	70		
ELL	40	48	36	42	42	26	18	63	65		
ASN	89	84		93	79				92		
BLK	35	43	39	35	44	39	26	59	65		
HSP	59	57	45	59	54	39	54	75	77		
MUL	75	64		77	69		79	75	91		
WHT	76	64	56	83	65	47	77	93	91		
FRL	48	51	42	48	49	37	40	67	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	61
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	87
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	47
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	62
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	74
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	74
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	55
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.

The ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance across all grade levels. Incoming 6th grade scores reflect gaps in proficiency skills and lacking self regulation that continues to transition to 7th and 8th grade. The majority of the level 1 students live in areas of generational poverty, according to the demographic data provided.

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

The Social Studies Achievement component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Incoming 6th grade scores reflect gaps in proficiency skills and lacking self regulation that continues to transition to 7th and 8th grade. The majority of the level 1 students live in areas of generational poverty, according to the demographic data provided.

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.

The Math and L/A bottom quartile had the largest gap compared to the state average. The contributing factors are decreased vocabulary skills and lack of proficiency in comprehension.

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

The ELA 8th grade component showed the most improvement due to writing and reading in content areas.

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

One third of our total student population performed at a Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Focus on Level 1 statewide assessment students
2. Improve ELA skills in ELA lowest 25th percentile
3. Improve Math skills in Math lowest 25th percentile
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities were identified as an area of weakness. Student learning is impacted due to the exceptionalities of this subgroup. One-third of this population did not meet the on-level requirements.

Measurable Outcome: We would like to improve the sub-group data from 32% to 42%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The teachers will be integrating and focusing on content vocabulary across grade levels.
The Reading Coach will be modeling and providing additional support to integrate interactive word walls throughout the school.
The teachers will be using the Achieve 3000 data to formulate lesson plans to differentiate reading instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is extensive research that supports teaching vocabulary and differentiating instruction based on skills students need.

Action Steps to Implement

Schoolwide Professional Development will focus on the integration and utilization of word walls to increase content vocabulary.

Schoolwide Professional Development will focus on using Achieve 3000 data to create differentiated lesson plans based on skills students need.

Person Responsible Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

The school leadership team will provide professional development opportunities for teachers to improve instruction in vocabulary building and differentiation. They will monitor the implementation of the use of these strategies.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We are working through a book study on Poor Students, Rich Teaching by Eric Jensen for professional development among staff.

We are implementing a school wide positive behavior incentive program.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0284 - Stewart Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		\$7,000.00	
			Notes: IXL				
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0284 - Stewart Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00	
			Notes: Flocabulary				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:					\$0.00
Total:						\$10,800.00	