

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Stewart Middle Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 86%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

**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  | 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 | 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  | 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 Rtl 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        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |

### Budget Approval

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

Yes