Stewart Middle Magnet School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/18/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (64%)
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

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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
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 and position title 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	
	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
52

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 10/15/2019

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	36	42	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	48	30	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	48	24	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	76	70	0	0	0	0	265

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	36	42	77	0	0	0	0	155

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	36	42	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	48	30	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	48	24	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	76	70	0	0	0	0	265

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	36	42	77	0	0	0	0	155

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	
Number of students enrolled	28 (0)	39 (0)	43 (0)	110 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (31)	7 (36)	14 (42)	30 (109)
One or more suspensions	8 (47)	9 (48)	3 (30)	20 (125)
Course failure in ELA or Math	15 (34)	35 (48)	33 (24)	83 (106)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	124 (119)	111 (76)	0 (70)	235 (265)

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	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	54%	8%	52%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%
	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%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		
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		

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	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
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%	
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%	

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	87
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	47
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	62
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	74
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	74
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	55
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.

Last years lowest performance was our Civics component. The contributing factor to the low performance is due to the STEP program and also having newer teachers who were not used to the curriculum.

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

The Civics EOC showed the greatest decline. The contributing factor to the low performance is due to the STEP program and also having newer teachers who were not used to the curriculum.

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 biggest gap that is shown is 2 points in ELA Learning gains for our lowest 25%. The factors contributing to this would be language barriers, lexile levels and vernacular depth.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was Learning gains in ELA and Science. Our school completed technology programs with our students to increase their understanding of the standards.

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

The first area of concern would be Reading across the curriculum. This would assist in all areas of curriculum.
The second area of concern would be Civics.

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

1. 1. Pre-Planning professional development of school data.
2. Professional Development on giving targeted feedback.
3. Professional Development on note taking
4. Professional Development of Content Vocabulary
5. On-going Walkthroughs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	The area of focus is to improve learning gains in reading for all students as denoted by FSA 2018-2019 testing.
Rationale	By focusing on increasing ELA scores from 55% to 62% in Reading, we can increase the schools' scores in all content areas of the curriculum.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The students will score 62% proficiency on the ELA portion of the FSA exam. Increase learning gains up to 60% on the ELA portion of the ELA exam.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	By increasing reading in all curriculum areas, the students will increase their proficiency
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data Chats, providing on-going targeted feedback, school wide use of academic vocabulary, school wide use of note taking (Cornell Notes), Targeted leaning targets, questioning
Action Step	
Description	1. Pre-Planning professional development of school data. 2. Professional Development on giving targeted feedback. 3. Professional Development on note taking 4. Professional Development of Content Vocabulary 5. On-going Walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	The area of focus is to integrate technology to help personalize the learning process.
Rationale	The rationale is to help students and teacher increase the personalized learning for FSA Reading and Mathematics to increase learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase bottom quartile learning gains from 43% ELA to 50% or above, 44% to 50 or above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data Chats, providing on-going targeted feedback, school wide use of academic vocabulary, school wide use of note taking (Cornell Notes), Targeted leaning targets, questioning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on the Visible Learning for Literacy the effect size is: 1) Vocabulary .67 2) Targeted feedback .75 3) Metacognitive Strategies .69 (Note taking)
Action Step	
Description	1. Pre-Planning professional development of school data. 2. Professional Development on giving targeted feedback. 3. Professional Development on note taking 4. Professional Development of Content Vocabulary 5. On-going Walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

#3	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

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).

To improve the learning gains in reading, we will increase the use of technology to personalize the learning for individual students.

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.

Provide school professional development training for faculty and staff
Provide on-going parent workshops for targeted skills

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.

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/ 00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities
Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

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

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources).

An annual inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated determines necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet student needs through a resource map.

To ensure that support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT: reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis; identifies instructional needs across the school; supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; reviews progress monitoring data of core classes to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; communicates school-wide data to PLCs; and facilitates problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar ensuring opportunities to review assessments, outcome data, and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/ specialists, PLC teacher liaisons, and others, as needed.

Title I:
PartA
Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.
TitleIV
Funds used provide academic enrichment activities for high-needs students including college and career counseling, STEM, arts, civics, IB/AP. Funds also support safe and healthy students through mental health services, drug and violence prevention and PE. Effective use of classroom technology is supported through PD.

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.

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

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

We have several partnerships with organizations including Derrick Brooks, DACCO, Just Full Service center/Project Link, Tampa Housing Authority, Successful Students, AVID college trips, NASA, and the high schools magnet programs.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: The area of focus is to improve learning gains in reading for all students as denoted by FSA 2018-2019 testing.				$2,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	0284 - Stewart Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$1,500.00
			Notes: Notes substitutes for Professional Development 15 @ 100.00 =1500.			
			0284 - Stewart Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$1,300.00
			Notes: Notes The cost of IXL licenses for 100 students.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: The area of focus is to integrate technology to help personalize the learning process.				$5,904.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		319-Technology-Related Professional and Technical Services	0284 - Stewart Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A		$5,904.00
			Notes: Notes Purchase of laptops to help 8@ 663.00 =5304 8@75 =600 = 5904			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus:				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus:				$0.00
					Total:	$8,704.00