

Putnam County School District

Middleton Burney Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Middleton Burney Elementary School

1020 HUNTINGTON RD, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/mbes

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Scranton

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Middleton Burney Elementary School

1020 HUNTINGTON RD, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/mbes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Middleton-Burney Elementary School will ensure high levels of learning for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Middleton-Burney Elementary will work with families and the community to ensure that all students are provided a high level, equitable education that promotes life-long, collaborative learners. Our students will succeed in the 21st century using innovative skills in a goal oriented technology rich environment. (Innovative skills: communication, creativity, critical thinking, collaboration)

In order for all students at Middleton-Burney to learn at high levels we will:

Build positive relationships with families and students.

Commit to being a Professional Learning Community.

Create goals and hold everyone accountable to the achievement of these goals.

Differentiate to fit the enrichment and intervention needs of all students. (there is always room for improvement)

Celebrate all perseverance and hard work.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Symonds, Rodney	Principal	Leads the school's management team Organizes, manages, evaluates, and supervise effective and clear procedures for operation and functioning of the school Ensures compliance with all laws, admin codes, and board policies Leads the school's planning processes Supervises instructional programs Evaluates lesson plans Observes classes and provides intentional feedback
Brady, Yolanda	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in his job duties and responsibilities Supervise students and consistently administer rules regarding student behavior Promote high student achievement Communicate with parents and school counselors on student progress
Wilde, Nancy	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/18/2020, Tiffany Scranton

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	122	141	140	135	146	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	812
Attendance below 90 percent	30	23	22	27	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	3	8	9	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	38	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	6	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	159	160	135	160	144	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	897
Attendance below 90 percent	24	49	39	30	35	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	2	5	8	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	58	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	2	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	159	160	135	160	144	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	897
Attendance below 90 percent	24	49	39	30	35	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	2	5	8	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	58	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	2	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	46%	57%	30%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	41%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	52%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	51%	63%	37%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	40%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	43%	51%	29%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	41%	53%	24%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	41%	-8%	58%	-25%
	2018	32%	40%	-8%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	43%	-4%	58%	-19%
	2018	26%	38%	-12%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	37%	42%	-5%	56%	-19%
	2018	37%	39%	-2%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	46%	-9%	62%	-25%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	53%	-1%	64%	-12%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	39%	44%	-5%	60%	-21%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	28%	38%	-10%	53%	-25%
	2018	38%	42%	-4%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	54	50	34	56	40	24				
ELL	30	50	40	37	54	38	19				
BLK	19	52		27	42		21				
HSP	34	54	44	41	55	39	24				
MUL	40	54		40	46						
WHT	52	55	64	54	64	70	43				
FRL	35	55	54	40	55	47	28				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	36	34	25	37	43	13				
ELL	22	36	40	40	51	47	27				
BLK	20	35	27	31	52		19				
HSP	30	42	40	47	54	50	33				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
MUL	40	47		55	40						
WHT	45	42		55	50		67				
FRL	32	43	42	47	51	45	39				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	31	36	16	30	26	13				
ELL	16	34	46	28	30	24	6				
BLK	27	61	82	27	58	64	12				
HSP	26	38	47	35	35	22	19				
MUL	45	67		50	67						
WHT	36	37	46	45	45	30	34				
FRL	29	41	51	37	40	29	23				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component showing the lowest performance was science achievement. Thirty percent of students were proficient in this area. This is a decline from last year's performance of 40%. Unfortunately, the contributing factor for such low levels of achievement is that science is not implemented in the curriculum as a focus point until students are in fifth grade.

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

3rd grade Math showed the greatest decline. A group of students with low math knowledge contributed to the decline in scores.

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.

3rd grade ELA/Math and 5th Science. When compared to the state average, Science Achievement had the greatest gap of 23 percentage points. Of equal importance is that both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement also had a similar gap of 20 percentage points each. The contributing factor for the large gap in science achievement is the trend of not making science instruction a focus until fifth grade. ELA and Math Achievement have consistently been lower than the state average. Contributing to this gap would be the lack of increased rigorous instruction in reading and math.

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

The ELA lowest quartile showed the most improvement. This component increased 23 percentage points from the previous year. The implementation of Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) in grades K-3 is a contributing factor for this improvement. LLI was introduced two years ago; therefore the third and fourth grade cohort will have had at least one year of LLI's intensive and small group instruction. Additionally, MBES has made Professional Learning Communities (PLC) a priority. Nearly half the current staff has attended the PLC Institute hosted by Solution Tree.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The potential area of concern is level 1 on statewide assessment. 112 students scored a level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. Core Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will focus on task-target alignment of standards. Planning together and discussing data of student progress will lead to improved instruction and greater proficiency of standards mastery.
---	--

Measurable Outcome: Proficiency on i-Ready data and FSA will be 42% in all areas. All teachers will be within 2 lessons of the pacing guide during monthly checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Board Configuration
Open Court Curriculum
Grades 3-5 Instruction Unit Blocks
Differentiation via iii & LLI
Data Analysis to direct instruction using iReady, Imagine Learning, FSA, standards mastery, etc

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on trends in FSA, as well as Imagine Learning and iReady results, we determined that a series of evidence-based strategies should be implemented to meet our goal. The common board configuration strategy ensures that students and teachers understand the standards. Implementation of new curriculums will focus on task and standards alignment. Additionally, the strategy of ongoing data analysis will support students with diverse needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze Current Data
2. Identify and group students into iii or LLI groups
3. Provide instruction using instructional unit blocks (teachers will participate in ongoing feedback with the school district to improve the unit blocks)

Person Responsible Nancy Wilde (nwilde@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The Lead Team will conduct walk-throughs, attend PLC's and monitor data monthly.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Due to our high Hispanic and migrant population, many of our parent involvement events focus on meeting the needs of these families. All communication that goes home to parents is written in English and Spanish. The first parent night is Hispanic Parent Night where information about their child's education is provided in English and Spanish. Additionally, some grade levels will conduct parent nights such as Kindergarten's Power pack Pajama Party. This parent night is designed to kickoff their power pack program where every two weeks students will take home a backpack of books and activities that they can work on with their parents. By the end of the year, they will have read at least 60 books at home with an adult. A science night and math night will also be planned during the school year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.