

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Stewart Middle Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Stewart Middle Magnet School

1125 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Baretta	Principal	
Favata, Darcy	Magnet Coordinator	SAC Chair, write and edit SIP, hold voting process for waivers and SIP
Rocca, David	Reading Coach	SAC Chair

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Instructional Leadership Team met twice during the summer to discuss data from standardized testing, school climate surveys, and school data like referrals and attendance. Each area of focus stems from one of these categories:

Standardized testing led to area of focus for standards aligned instruction.

Climate surveys led to an area of focus for CHAMPS implementation.

Climate surveys and referral data led to an area of focus on student engagement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be monitored during SAC Meetings and through regular progress monitoring in ILT and administrative meetings. We will revise the plan as we gather data from the sources that generated the areas of focus. We will modify as FAST data, School City data, Discipline data, and School Climate survey data is available to see if we are on track to achieve our goals, or if there needs to be a change in implementation to ensure we achieve our them..

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	52	63	181	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	78	51	152	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	62	76	239	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	30	65	173	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	13	38	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	66	50	159

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	115	113	314	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	55	76	220	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	72	93	249	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	55	76	220	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	27	66

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	10	15	53	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	115	113	314
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	55	76	220
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	72	93	249
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	55	76	220

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	27	66	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	10	15	53	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	49	49	49	49	50	50	51		
ELA Learning Gains				46			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			32		
Math Achievement*	53	57	56	48	36	36	40		
Math Learning Gains				54			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			34		
Science Achievement*	40	44	49	42	52	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	66	68	76	58	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	80	84	73	88	51	49	77		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	22	39	40	56	86	76	60		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	47			
HSP	54			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	47			
HSP	57			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			53			40	65	80			22
SWD	20			27			4	35			4	
ELL	35			45			14	58	56		6	22
AMI												
ASN	71			88							2	
BLK	36			37			28	51	81		5	
HSP	50			59			43	69	76		6	24
MUL	63			48							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			80			62	91	82		5	
FRL	40			46			33	58	78		6	23

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	49	46	35	48	54	54	42	76	88			56
SWD	16	36	33	18	35	44	9	33				
ELL	36	43	50	45	57	71	24	68	83			56
AMI												
ASN	86	79		71	79							
BLK	38	42	31	33	48	46	24	69	88			
HSP	50	46	39	52	57	61	44	73	84			59
MUL	49	47	38	49	47		46	70	92			
PAC												
WHT	75	53		72	58		83	97	96			
FRL	42	42	35	41	51	52	34	72	83			55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	48	32	40	33	34	47	62	77			60
SWD	11	22	18	7	15	20	9	41				30
ELL	43	45	43	31	31	48	28	60	71			60
AMI												
ASN	100			82								
BLK	34	38	29	22	28	31	29	49	71			
HSP	55	48	34	42	29	35	47	65	70			61
MUL	67	65		58	56	55	80	69	90			
PAC												
WHT	79	70		72	53		80	88	91			
FRL	45	44	32	32	29	32	38	57	69			60

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
07	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	47%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	53%	-14%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	36%	-8%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	57%	4%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	41%	-2%	44%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	55%	37%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	49%	46%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	64%	0%	66%	-2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our 8th grade science scores were at 38% proficiency which is 4% lower than the year before and 3% lower than the district. 6th grade math students also showed 39% proficiency, which is significantly below the district proficiency percentage of 53%. Many of the 6th grade math students had a rotation of teachers because of vacancies, thus contributing to instability in instruction. However, it is important to note that although the 6th grade proficiency level is low, they did increase by 16% from the prior year.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was 6th and 7th grade ELA with a -4 in proficiency levels. Civics also showed a significant decline of -12% from the prior year, but that was because of the inclusion of low-level reading students taking the Civics EOC where in prior years, some students could be excluded until their 8th grade year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our Geometry students and Algebra students showed the greatest gap when compared to the district average, but for the positive. Geometry was at 95% proficiency while the district was at 44%, and Algebra maintained a 92% proficiency while the district was at 54%. Students excelling in Geometry and Algebra exists at Stewart because of our Math Academy acceleration process that pushed students who excel in mathematics to take higher level math classes. On the negative side, our 6th grade Math students showed the most significant disparity when their 39% proficiency rate is compared to the district's 53%. We attribute this gap to the lack of consistent instructors in the math classes.

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

Sixth grade Math proficiency, although low in comparison to the district, was also an area that showed the most improvement overall from previous years. Although there was a rotation of teachers, there were specific supports always in place that served as a constant like IXL, progress monitoring, and targeted tutoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Potential areas of concern:

8th Grade Science
6th Grade Mathematics

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

1. Increase 8th Grade Science Proficiency
2. Increase 6th Grade Math Proficiency
3. Increase 6th Grade and 7th Grade ELA Proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

On the Spring 2023 Panorama Survey 27% of students said they enjoyed the School Climate, which was down 8% from Fall 2022. Forty-four percent of students felt there were positive Teacher/Student Relationships, which was down 8% from Fall 2022. Thirty percent of students felt a Sense of Belonging, which was down 4% from Fall of 2022. These areas being low also correlates to our issues with teacher retention and high referral rates.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Fall Panorama Survey will increase to 50% for school climate.

Fall Panorama Survey will increase to 60% for teacher/student relationships.

Fall Panorama Survey will increase to 40% for Sense of Belonging.

There will be a 50% decrease in referrals and the number of teachers leaving Stewart will decrease by half from the previous year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

CHAMPS will be instituted schoolwide and procedures will be reinforced through walk-throughs and regular interaction with staff and students. A school wide discipline plan details violations of CHAMPS procedures with step-by-step instructions. The CHAMPS Champions will open their rooms to be demonstration classrooms and will roll out on-going training to maintain adherence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Article: Is CHAMPS evidenced based?

<https://ancorapublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Is-CHAMPS-Evidence-Based.pdf>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Page 2, last paragraph of article: "Educational research has shown that when these levels of support (through CHAMPS implementation)

are in place and incorporate the meaningful involvement of relevant parties (e.g., teachers, parents, peers),

positive student outcomes can be achieved."

Page 2, last paragraph of article: "CHAMPS is a systematic, prevention-oriented approach that guides teachers in providing universal classroom supports likely to promote appropriate behavior and reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schoolwide use of CHAMPS procedures for Tier 1
Tier 1 CHAMPS displays in hallways and classrooms
Walk-throughs to determine Tier 1 fidelity
Behavior Matrix Flow Chart to aid with interventions
Discipline Plan for violations of Tier 1
RtI Teacher Leader and MTSS for Tier 2 and beyond

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

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Proficiency in 6th grade math, 6th and 7th grade ELA, and 8th grade science indicated deficiencies in particular strands that were standard specific. Targeted tutoring, walk-throughs, and PLCs will focus on standards based instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA PM3 Proficiency will be:

6th Grade 55%

7th Grade 50%

Mathematics PM3 Proficiency will be:

6th Grade - 50%

8th Grade Science Proficiency will increase to 54%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Common assessments will be used to drive collaborative discussion of effective strategies and instructional delivery. Based on underlying trends, we will provide additional academic support to students in the form of tutoring and ELP before, during, and after school. We will use PLC planning to target instructional practices that are effective and provide differentiated learning opportunities based on formative data collected from common assessments. Walk-throughs for curriculum pacing checks, standards aligned instruction, CHAMPS, and authentic engagement will occur daily. We will support teachers in need as observed during the walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making, September 2009
<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/12>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose this strategy because a lot of our decision-making revolves around progress monitoring. We have several tools to be able to monitor student progress (FAST, IXL, McGraw-Hill, PENDA, AlgebraNation, GeometryNation, Progress Learning), so it is important to know what the results mean and what to do with the results once we have them.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data analysis training

Progress monitoring through IXL, FAST, Progress Learning, Algebra Nation, Geometry Nation, PENDA Instructional Leadership Team meetings to discuss data, and create and implement, and evaluate and strategic approach to weaknesses.

Individual data chats to discuss progress monitoring results to create buy-in from students

Tutoring and ELP before, during, and after school

Twice monthly subject area Professional Learning Communities to discuss common planning, data analysis, and targeted strategies

Walk-throughs for curriculum pacing checks, standards aligned instruction, CHAMPS, and authentic engagement

Support teachers in need as observed during walk-throughs

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

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During walk-throughs last school year, although students might have been on task and compliant, sometimes they were not authentically engaged. This lack of engagement can contribute to classroom management issues and high referral rates. We would like to increase student engagement to promote a more positive school climate, decrease referrals, and create more in-depth learning of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA PM3 Proficiency will be:

6th Grade 55%

7th Grade 50%

8th Grade 50%

Mathematics PM3 Proficiency will be:

6th Grade - 50%

7th Grade - 40%

8th Grade - 65%

Algebra - 95%

Geometry - 97%

8th Grade Science Proficiency will increase to 54%.

Civics EOC will increase to 74%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use PLC planning to target instructional practices that are engaging and provide differentiated learning opportunities. Walk-throughs for curriculum pacing checks, standards aligned instruction, CHAMPS, and authentic engagement will occur daily. We will support teachers in need as observed during the walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Baretta Wilson (baretta.wilson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Student Engagement: Why it is important and how to promote it

<https://www.branchingminds.com/blog/student-engagement-remote-in-person>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Paragraph 7 of article from above source: "Student engagement can be seen as the glue that holds together all aspects of student learning and growth. Not only does student engagement make teaching itself more fun, engaging, and rewarding, but it has been shown to have critical impacts on students. When students display high levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement, they are more likely to excel academically, form a stronger sense of connection with their school, and have a more positive sense of social-emotional well-being."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data analysis training

Progress monitoring through IXL, FAST, Progress Learning, Algebra Nation, Geometry Nation, PENDA Instructional Leadership Team meetings to discuss data, and create and implement, and evaluate and strategic approach to weaknesses.

Individual data chats to discuss progress monitoring results to create buy-in from students

Tutoring and ELP before, during, and after school

Twice monthly subject area Professional Learning Communities to discuss common planning, data analysis, and targeted strategies

Walk-throughs for curriculum pacing checks, standards aligned instruction, CHAMPS, and authentic engagement

Support teachers in need as observed during walk-throughs

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

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be posted on our website. It will also be disseminated via ParentLink automated texts/emails in English and Spanish, and through social media platforms. Translation services from web browsers will translate the SIP to designated home languages when the recipient chooses translation services.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parents, families, and other community stakeholders are encouraged to participate and volunteer on our School Advisory Committee, Parent Teacher Student Association, and STEM Boosters Club. They are also encouraged to volunteer for fieldtrips and onsite activities. Extracurricular activities promote spectators for sports and volunteers for clubs and tutoring. Weekly ParentLink messages detail organized communication of upcoming events and activities like progress report delivery, ongoing parent workshops, and conference nights. An updated website and active social media presence also communicate live events with detail.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Offer advanced curricula for all students; provide targeted tutoring before, during, and after school; provide unique high school course offerings; provide academic support services and courses; conduct progress monitoring to guide early intervention; conduct data chats that allow for student ownership; provide coursework that is unique to and embedded with our school STEM and space magnet theme

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The plan was developed in coordination with SEL programs like Second Step, Project Link, and Frameworks Tampa Bay; all of which provide lessons and SEL support for Area of Focus 1 Culture and Climate. Our career and technical education programs are unique to Stewart when compared to district middle school offerings, and they help strengthen our academic program and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum like question 3 in this section asks. Title I funds purchase our RtI Teacher Leader who facilitates Tier 1 and beyond interventions and runs the MTSS process. Title I funds also purchase our Reading Coach who trains and coaches all subject areas in literacy best practices, and data analysis and interventions.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes