

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Stewart 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

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: 4/10/2005

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

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McNamara, Anne Marie	ESE Specialist	Responsible for ESE students. SAC chairperson
Swartwood, Eric		Co-chairperson of SAC
Weiss, Susan		Supervise Staff and Faculty
Wilson, Baretta		To supervise all aspects of Stewart Middle Magnet.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 4/10/2005, 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.*

4

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

840

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

5

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

7

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	256	267	276	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	67	76	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	38	39	0	0	0	0	106
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	67	40	64	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	58	68	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	16

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	11	21	14	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	8	0	0	0	0	34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 12/1/2021

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	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	

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	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

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				62%	51%	54%	58%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	47%	47%	41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				62%	55%	58%	63%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	57%	60%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	47%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				58%	47%	51%	54%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	67%	72%	78%	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	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	52%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	64%	53%	11%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	68%	62%	6%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	26%	31%	-5%	46%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	58%	47%	11%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	57%	37%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All Grades: School City, Instructional Planning Tool, Achieve3000

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	20%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	15%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	41%	44%
	English Language Learners	6%	5%	5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.8%	48%	49.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.4%	44.6%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	26.6%	40%	34.1%
	English Language Learners	33%	41%	54%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	28%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	22%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	72%	75%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	27%	29.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	27%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	28.5%	27%	7.4%
	English Language Learners	30%	30%	65%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33.6%	51%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	51%	91%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	46%	89%
	English Language Learners	51%	49%	71%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66%	72%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	31%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	93%	90%	89%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31%	42%	20.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	41%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	37%	8.8%
	English Language Learners	33%	49%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	73%	42%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	20%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	91%	60%	23.1%
	English Language Learners	17%	4%	27%

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	22	18	7	15	20	9	41			
ELL	43	45	43	31	31	48	28	60	71		
ASN	100			82							
BLK	34	38	29	22	28	31	29	49	71		
HSP	55	48	34	42	29	35	47	65	70		
MUL	67	65		58	56	55	80	69	90		
WHT	79	70		72	53		80	88	91		
FRL	45	44	32	32	29	32	38	57	69		
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		

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	48
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	46
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	91
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	37
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	49
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	68
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	76
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The grade level data shows a decrease in sixth grade and eighth grade Math, as well as SWD & African American students. The lowest 25% showed a decrease of negative one and the Math lowest percentile showed a decrease of negative four. Math high school courses, Algebra and Geometry, also showed a decline.

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

The greatest need for improvement would be our SWD & African American group for the 2019 reading and math assessments.

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

The COVID pandemic is a factor due to the students doing e-learning without having to be accountable for some subjects. Also the e-learning platform was a negative factor due to students not being in class sessions, on the computer, at the appropriate times. The e-learning caused an issue of students thinking they did not have to report to class and the external distractions of the World Wide Web impeded academic focus.

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

The greatest improvement in the state assessments was the science achievement. Science improved from 48% in 2018 to 58% in 2019.

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

The school used a science standards based computer program to increase the knowledge of our students.

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

The strategies we will be using to accelerate learning is the progress monitoring tool, data chats with all students, and having students create quarterly goals with the specific data.

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.

We are having district personnel come to the school to provide learning opportunities to support our teachers and leaders. In the ESE department, specific trainings and learning opportunities will occur on a monthly basis and continuous support from district personnel is available.

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

We are having grade level and core classes come to lunch and learns, tutoring before and after school, and extra assistance by our Reading coach and lead teacher. Also, second semester will offer specifically targeted students, identified by MTSS/RtI data, being involved in a DBT-A tier 1, self-advocacy group meeting one a week.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Research from the book Visible Learning by John Hattie, states that specific practices must be in place in a classroom in order to maximize learning potential. This learning potential is given a numeric value based on meta-analysis. Instructional coaching will focus on ensuring classrooms utilize the most effective forms of visible learning.

Measurable Outcome: Over the course of the school year, students will make consistent gains in ELA, Math, Civics, and Science.

Monitoring: Administrators will conduct walk-throughs using a walkthrough instrument detailing four areas of focus for classrooms. Teachers will receive this walk-through instrument and be graded on their performance based on usage of the visible learning strategies. Once the strategies are implemented with more efficiency, student gains should be noted on Baselines, Midyears, daily observation, ACHIEVE 3000, IXL, and AlgebraNation.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The four areas of focus for achieving visible learning are Focus on Student Engagement, Focus on Clarity and Clear Intentions, Focus on Teaching/Learning Strategies, and Focus on Feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the book Visible Learning by John Hattie, the four areas mentioned above have the highest meta-cognitive return. Thus, the best environment and opportunity for students to make gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Visible Learning Book Study - Admin (Wilson, Weiss, Samaras)

Create a walk-through instrument- Favata-Santos

Professional Development for Teachers - Admin (Wilson, Weiss, Samaras)

Bi-weekly walkthroughs with instrument- (ILT)

The non-evaluative instrument will be returned to teachers to collaborate on grade level and subject area meetings (Admin, SALs, Team Leaders)

A needs assessment will be conducted from the walk-through instrument observations, and professional development activities will focus on those areas of need. (ILT)

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

Walk-through outcomes will show a direct impact on student gains via progress monitoring tools like School City, IXL (Math ELA, Science), AlgebraNation, and ACHIEVE 3000. Students who show needs based off of the progress monitoring will be pulled for tutoring and remediation. In addition to existing interventions, ELL students will be given an ELL support-from-home backpack, SWD students will receive small group interventions, and FRL students will be offered access to technology at home.

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

Teachers who are not meeting expectations with their visible learning strategies will be coached further on what qualifies as student engagement, how to properly implement standards-based learning, how to use proper teaching and learning strategies, as well as, how to find and use information from data sources to provide proper feedback. (Reading Coach, SALs, and DRTs)

Person Responsible Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@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.

The schoolwide data shows discipline decreasing in comparison to other years, but it still too high compared to other middle schools in the state. We have also noted that over time, there have been fluctuations in disciplinary problems. Our primary concern is that we are rated as a school with "Very High" status. This is not a desirable designation, and means we have to intervene more especially with violent incidents like fights and violent attacks. We are rated #484 out of 553 statewide and #30 out of 46 districtwide.

To curb our discipline issues, our MTSS, Rtl Team and PTSA are implementing behavior-based incentives.

The school purchased an Rtl Teacher Leader who focuses on behavioral and academic intervention.

There is a Men of Vision group and a Ladies of Elegance group that meets weekly to mentor at-risk students.

There are several mental health groups, students identified by the MTSS/Rtl Teacher Leader, that focus on coping skills.

MTSS/Rtl Teacher Leader will track behaviors and intervene once a problem is identified.

Discipline history will be monitored weekly on EdConnect (Behavior Tracker).

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.

Positive school culture promotes collaboration among all stakeholders, honesty between students and hard work to achieve goals to benefit the community and society around us. At Stewart Middle Magnet School, we strive to be proactive in building activities which promotes a higher level of achievement. At Stewart Middle Magnet we believe in preparing all our students for opportunities of growth and to take ownership of their learning. We accomplish this by analyzing where they currently are and where they want to be, we nurture the student to reach their highest potential across all demographics. We demonstrate my high

expectations for students by employing strategies to ensure that all have access to a rigorous curriculum. By unleashing this potential, we promote and embrace the cultural diversity for all students, staff, and society.

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

Students develop and lead action-oriented projects related to an issue that they identify. Students at Stewart Middle School demonstrate an understanding of issues of inequity related to them, their community and the current issues in society.

Families will be actively involved in student academic success

Faculty and teacher intentionally connect the community to the classroom, and the classroom to the community through school-wide magnet events, Parent Student Teacher Association (PTSA) sponsored events, and district scheduled events.

Community Members

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00