

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Monroe Middle Magnet School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 2/14/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fillhart, Barbara	Principal	Oversee school operations
Micciche, Debra	Math Coach	SAC Chair Collaborates with teachers to incorporate IB standards into daily lessons, and to implement small groups.
Geathers, Demetria	Teacher, K-12	HCTA Teacher Representative 8th grade Teacher of history Implements frameworks and IB standards through small groups and cooperative learning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 2/14/2019, 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

423

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	139	116	147	0	0	0	0	402	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	40	42	0	0	0	0	129	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	46	50	0	0	0	0	147	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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	47	40	42	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	46	50	0	0	0	0	147

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	18	24	1	0	0	0	0	43

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				40%	51%	54%	38%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				41%	52%	54%	46%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	47%	47%	41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				47%	55%	58%	44%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	57%	54%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	52%	51%	42%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				39%	47%	51%	34%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				53%	67%	72%	57%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	55%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
08	2021					
	2019	29%	31%	-2%	46%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	48%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	67%	-14%	71%	-18%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	63%	24%	61%	26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used for ELA - Achieve3000

The progress monitoring tool used for Math - baseline and formative testing

The progress monitoring tool used for Civics - baseline and formative testing

The progress monitoring tool used for Science - baseline and formative testing

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	22%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	17%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	22%	31%
	English Language Learners	14%	13%	13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	45%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	37.63%	
	Students With Disabilities	18.30%	31.04%	
	English Language Learners	25.25%	47.25%	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	21%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	12%	12%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	21%	19%
	English Language Learners	9%	13%	12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.70%	38.33%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.10%	31.63%	
	Students With Disabilities	9.25%	37.51%	
	English Language Learners	25.10%	64.16%	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32.80%	34.26%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.20%	34.26%	
	Students With Disabilities	-	27.51%	
	English Language Learners	3.30%	24.12%	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	29%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	20%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	20%	33%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	68%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.90%	55.92%	
	Students With Disabilities	25.10%	61.64%	
	English Language Learners	43.40%	67.59%	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	51%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.05%	39.12%	
	Students With Disabilities	50.40%	46.79%	
	English Language Learners	21.75%	71.60%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	20	14	5	18	19	6	16			
ELL	29	38	35	21	37	38	33	15			
BLK	21	26	25	12	20	17	3	26			
HSP	39	43	32	26	29	32	34	31	73		
MUL	44	34		35	29			45			
WHT	58	49	40	57	37	10	61	75	75		
FRL	32	34	28	21	25	24	27	33	61		
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						

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	19
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	51
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Mathematics –across the board dropped except for Algebra 1. Our seventh-grade students performed the lowest of our three grade levels. This has not been a typical trend for our seventh graders in the past. There is a trend that our ESE and African American students have scored the lowest every year and they are our bottom quartile students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math's bottom quartile (-30) and learning gains (-31).

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A contributing factor for learning gains was a teacher that retired late in the 1st quarter and was far behind on the curriculum, Other contributing factors would be change in teachers and the students in and out of school. Half of the students were on eLearning the first semester. New actions needed to address improvements will be small group instruction focusing on the standards to fulfill the learning gaps/unfinished learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Algebra 1 showed the most improvement (+7).

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We offered Algebra 1 and Algebra Research back-to-back. New curriculum was introduced in the Algebra 1 class: students were introduced to the subject matter and given homework and the next day we would have the research class where students could ask questions and receive additional help and clarification with concepts.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Administer progress monitoring assessments to gather data.
2. Small group instruction using data to group students in order to accelerate learning gaps/unfinished learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Set up demonstration classrooms to observe small group instruction.
2. In PLC's use data from assessments to help plan and define groups, meet bi-monthly.
3. Provide bi-weekly in-service workshop on the IB Principles & Practices.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

- ~Administration meeting with SAL's bi-weekly to discuss data and progress monitoring of goals.
- ~ Subject Area Leaders will meet in PLCs to plan and discuss data
- ~ Administrators and teacher leaders will conduct classroom walkthroughs with feedback on the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction and IB Principles and Practices.
- ~ ILT will meet monthly to review and discuss data (insight, PBIS, plan, IB Policies and practices, parent/family engagement plan) and make adjustments as necessary.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We know that our students have been in and out of school for the better part of last year. Therefore, there are significant learning and social emotional deficits. Areas of most concern is our ESE and African American population, which in turn is also our bottom quartile. We have shown to have a deficit in this area on the FSA over the last number of years. We will use the baseline assessment in each core subject area to discover the standards and content deficiencies. By using small group instruction this will address content deficiencies.
Measurable Outcome:	We will have three percent gains in ELA, Math, Science and Civics. Also, three percent gains in bottom quartile and learning gains for and ELA on FSA assessments. If you look at the data our OSS has declined each year over the last six years. Our goal is to keep our students in the learning environment so they do not lose instructional time. We have created a behavior matrix to provide more interventions prior to referrals. RTI and PSLT teams will monitor our disciplinary numbers and watch the trends that they are showing monthly.
Monitoring:	Civics and Science will use the progress monitoring data as well as second quarter data. Math will use the baseline assessment, the formative data (2nd and 3rd quarter) and midyear assessment to progress monitor. ELA will use the baseline data and compare it to the midterm data as well as the writing mid-year data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Fillhart (barbara.fillhart@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction: teachers will plan and implement small group instruction to increase instructional time, peer interaction, and address gaps and push student thinking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction address learning gaps and pushes student thinking. Demonstration classes will be utilized for professional development with teachers. Small group instruction is part of our district's instructional frameworks in each subject for instructional delivery.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and subject area leaders will visit classrooms to progress monitor implementation and provide feedback of small group instruction weekly.

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

Demonstration classrooms will be provide to staff for professional development.

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

Within small group instruction African American and SWD students lowest standards will be identified and targeted for acceleration.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Monroe Middle Magnet is ranked 541 out of 553 for middle schools statewide. Our highest incidents is property incidents. If you look at the data our OSS has declined each year over the last four years. Our goal is to keep students in the learning environment so they do not lose instructional time. We utilize a behavior matrix to add interventions prior to referrals. Our RTI and PSLT teams will monitor our disciplinary numbers and watch trends bi-monthly.

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.

Parent and Community Involvement is a critical component in creating a positive school culture. When all stakeholder, both on and off campus, work together it builds an environment that supports and encourages student achievement. At South Tampa Academy we combine our SAC, Parent and Family Involvement Committee, and PTSA meetings to ensure that everyone is working together to create positive cohesive plans that support our students. By combining these stakeholder groups, we are able strengthen and carry out both our School Improvement Plan and Parent and Family Engagement Plan with fidelity. In addition, this year we have instituted a Student Ambassador Club which will work hand in hand with Student Government to not only encourage students on campus to have a stronger voice, but to build leadership skills as well.

This year we will add IB Parent Nights that will be held each Semester, a new PBIS program that builds upon our "Leadership Tree" recognition program where students are encouraged to display the IB Student Leadership Profile traits. We also reached out to parents in the first day packets to build our Great American Teach-In Program in November. This we feel will further our efforts to help students recognize how their learning connects to the community and world. We feel that the strategies mentioned will not only support a positive culture on campus, but encourage students growth and learning both in and out of the classroom.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

As a Title 1 school, we believe that communication is key. Each week our principal sends out voice and text messages in order to keep parents, community members, students, teachers and faculty abreast of upcoming events. She also goes on the morning show each morning to recognize students for their accomplishments, and make sure that they do not miss out on any events or activities. Also, the Principal

and Guidance Counselor work the car line in the afternoon where they personally remind parents of upcoming events. Furthermore, through the monthly newsletter which is emailed to each family and then posted on the website parents, students, faculty and community members are provided information on how an IB classroom and school community operates. Also included are strategies for helping students at home, information and links to access Canvas, upcoming events, Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) tips, and pictures of student learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00