Burney Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Burney Elementary School

901 S EVERS ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brooke Quinlan   Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Burney Elementary School

901 S EVERS ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

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-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide a supportive and engaging learning environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time.

Our vision is to prepare students to be life-long learners and contributing members of their communities.

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
Chisholm, Connie	Principal	Leadership team meeting include the following: Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, RTI Specialist, Guidance Counselor, SSW, School Psychologist, Media Specialist, ESE teachers, ELL Resource teacher, ILT team leaders. The team meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of highly effective classroom practices are occurring at all levels (intensive, enrichment-Tier 1, 2, 3). 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of the SIP goal in curriculum, behavioral, and attendance. 4. Communicate school-wide data to grade level PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 1/7/2020, Brooke Quinlan

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson]()
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	45	48	50	54	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	12	15	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	20	56	47	70	55	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298
Attendance below 90 percent	18	26	28	24	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	6	11	10	18	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	1	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	20	56	47	70	55	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298
Attendance below 90 percent	18	26	28	24	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	6	11	10	18	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	1	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	27%	52%	57%	26%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	35%	55%	58%	48%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	53%	45%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	54%	63%	32%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	57%	62%	41%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	50%	53%	20%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	55%	-34%	58%	-37%
	2018	25%	55%	-30%	56%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	26%	54%	-28%	56%	-30%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	29%	54%	-25%	62%	-33%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison	-16%					
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	6	24	33	16	23	14	9				
ELL	24	27		41	51	38	6				
BLK	22	39	38	25	37		8				
HSP	28	32	36	46	51	50	23				
WHT	36			38	40						
FRL	27	35	39	40	46	32	22				

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	17	45		24	63	60					
ELL	21	48	55	36	57						
BLK	32	29		35	76						
HSP	35	55	57	43	68		37				
WHT	40			63							
FRL	35	49	61	44	70	65	43				

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	11	34	40	24	51	44	9				
ELL	22	47		32	50		8				
BLK	29	46		29	33		25				
HSP	24	56	58	31	49	40	13				
WHT	30	31		35	23		30				
FRL	25	48	48	31	41	42	19				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Science: Students did not have a strong foundation of science benchmarks. Lack of active thinking strategies in the classroom and two new teachers to 5th grade teaching science who had limited knowledge of 5th grade math standards. During the 2019-2020, the school received 5th support in this area from the District weekly (review of data and lesson planning).

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

Bottom Quartile in Math: During the 2018-2019 school term half of our bottom quartile are ESE students. One of the ESE was out for half of the year and consistent teaching was not done with those students. Students lacked effort, general education teachers were not consistent with pulling additional materials for the bottom quartile students. Attendance was a concern for students and teachers. During the 2019-2020 school term, weekly grade level planning (all grade levels) held with math coach, monthly grade assessment given (designed by district math coaches) and data was dis aggregated by grade levels and used to plan and implement lesson in small groups (remediation and enrichment).Math Coach was pulled half year to cover class of teachers who were out for maternity leave in grades 4 and 5.

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.

ELA Achievement: During 2018-2019 Burney students lack some of the foundational skills in the areas of reading fluently and comprehension. Students come to school with a lack of vocabulary and background knowledge. Burney is 97% free lunch. During the 2019-2020, Reading Coach did grade level planning weekly,
common assessments given (starting in January); data was reviewed by teams and lesson differentiation took place (remediation, enrichment). Small group tutoring of foundational skills daily for targeted students. Reading Coach was pulled half year to cover class of teachers who were out for maternity leave in grades 4 and 5.

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

Math Achievement: Math planning was scheduled weekly with each grade level for one hour. Teachers gained insight into the standards and were able to use additional materials to support the learning. During the 2019-2020 school year, school implemented new math series (Envision) and provided detailed support through district planning support system. All students grades 1-5 were given math flashcards to increase math fluency of basic facts. Teachers received training, "Hot Topics, Cool Moves" to improve accountable talk during math discussions.

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

ESE , Black, Hispanic, White, SWD and ELL students continues to be a concern based on data from 2019-2020 in areas of reading and mathematics.

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

1. Raise Student Achievement Levels (Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile in all subgroups)
2. Effective Classroom Environments Held to High Expectations
3. Cultivate a Safe and Collaborative Culture
4. Enhancing Positive Behaviors
5. Strengthen Parent Engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In review of classroom observations, data gathered by administration, most tasks observed were not aligned to grade level standards. Due to the lack of alignment, tasks were not at the level of rigor required for mastery.
Measurable Outcome:	During 2020-2021 school term: Teachers: During weekly planning sessions with academic coaches teachers will design lessons that are aligned to instructional standards that engage students and promote classroom discussions. By October 2020, classroom tasks taught will be aligned to instructional standards and engaging as observed by administration walk-throughs 60% of the time. By May 2021, classroom tasks taught will be aligned to instructional standards and engaging as observed by administration walk-throughs 90% of the time. Students: Common assessment data in ELA will show growth 40% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment data in Math will show growth 50% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment data in Science will show growth 50% of students performing at or above proficiency. (District Form Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostics, Grade-level created assessments, District Monthly assessments, Achieve 3000 assessments, etc.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and Coaches will participate in weekly common planning with a focus on tasks that are aligned to Florida standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formal and informal data reveal the task portion of the teachers' lessons are not always aligned to standards. During planning, teachers often did not have the opportunity to develop classroom standards based task.

Action Steps to Implement

Structures for Standards Planning
Setting tone for planning
1- Coaches will use specific resources during planning (ELA & Math).
- Agendas for planning will be sent to teachers 3-5 days prior to planning session.
- Math Coach will use the book "Math in Practice". Reading Coach will use "A Guide to Reading Conferences" and "Visible Learning" during planning.
-Teachers will come to planning prepared (read material prior; bring resources needed etc).
-Each grade level planning will include designing tasks aligned to standard that are engaging and rigorous.
-Lesson will include common assessments and explicitly written HOT Questions,
- All lessons and task will be uploaded to OneDrive.

Person Responsible	Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

2 Implementation in class
-Teachers will deliver lessons in classrooms based on planning to including the planned tasks.
-Data will be collected by administration from walk-throughs.
-Data will be gathered by coaches and teachers; followed by discussion of outcomes during data chats

and
PLCs.

Person Responsible   Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

3. Coaching Cycles
-Based on data, discussions, observations and teacher needs, Reading & Math Coaches will provide coaching cycles with feedback. Regular training for engangement/discussion strategies will occur throughout the year to meet the needs of the teachers.
-Teachers will be tiered based on experience, knowledge of curriculum, grade level, etc.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

4. Administrators will perform monthly classroom walk-throughs, formal and informal observations. The data collected will be uploaded to One Drive. District support for training and coaching will be provided. Administration will attend planning sessions, PLC's, data chats, etc.

Person Responsible   Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

Reading and math coaches will provide additional reading and math small groups to meet the needs of students in each subgroup (ESE, ELL, Black/African American, White, Economic Disadvantaged). Data will be used to monitor progress toward students' achievement goals and to adjust their backward plans.

Person Responsible   Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on Administrative classroom observation data, the majority of the classroom lessons observed focused on whole group instruction. The observation data indicates a strong need for differentiation in small group lessons in ELA and Math to support the students' needs.
Measurable Outcome:	For Teachers: By November 2020, 80% percent of the classroom instruction will be differentiated in small groups for all learners as measured by administrative data and teacher plans. Students: Common assessment data in ELA will show growth 40% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment data in Math will show growth 50% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment data in Science will show growth 50% of students performing at or above proficiency. (District Form Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostics, Grade-level created assessments, District Monthly assessments, Achieve 3000 assessments, etc.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and Coaches will participate in weekly common planning with a focus on creating highly differentiated lessons based on needs of learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formal and informal data reveal the majority of instructional time is spent with teachers conducting whole group learning activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each week, teachers will participate in standards based planning sessions with coaches (reading and/or math) who will facilitate differentiated instructional models.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

2. Daily, teachers will informally/formally assess students to determine the needs of their classrooms for small groups (exit tickets, running records, observation notes, etc). Lesson plans will be kept to monitor the fidelity of the lessons.

Staff will use strategic and intensive research based interventions for small group instruction.

District personnel and academic coaches will provide training in small group interventions.

RtI Specialist will monitor the student data to determine if further support/testing or interventions are required.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

3. Staff will implement differentiated small group lessons within the regular school day, after school, Saturday Academy, and pull out/push in ELP tutors. All instruction will be provided to meet the needs of

the students with strategic and research based curriculum. Lesson plans and data will be monitored for the small groups.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

4. Each grade level will meet with Coaches to analyze student data and classwork (Data Days) for planning lessons that focus on creating highly differentiated learning. During school, substitutes will be provided so coaches can meet monthly with grade levels to analyze data, restructure small groups, plan interventions for all subgroups. Coaches will engage with teachers to plan "next steps".

Reading and Math Coach will provide differentiated small group lessons for targeted students in each grade level (3-5) based on common assessments.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

5. Administration will perform formal and informal observations that focus on successful differentiated small group instruction (District Instructional Rubric: Domain 1 and 3) with feedback throughout the year. Administration coaching sessions will include teacher reflection, review item analysis and critical attributes of rubric, goals for success, and followup observation.

Person Responsible   Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

Staff use strategic and intensive, researched-based interventions through after school tutoring, Saturday school or daytime tutoring to provide additional reading and math groups to meet the needs of all the students in each subgroup (ESE, ELL, Black/African American, White, Economic Disadvantaged). Teachers will utilize technology to help engage students and for intensive remediation as well as enrichment. Staff use data to monitor progress toward students' achievement goals and to adjust their backward plans

Person Responsible   Connie Chisholm (connie.chisholm@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school vision and goals will create a culture and climate that promote high expectations and are observed by all stakeholders. School leaders establish a sense of urgency for school improvement. A clear, consistent
school wide behavior system that includes rewards and positive interventions is evident. Student House "Teams" will continue and be supported by all staff. Burney will continue to as a PBIS school under the guidance of the RtI Specialist. All teachers will support and utilize "Bronco Bucks". Teachers will maintain a weekly "bucks" spreadsheet for their classes. Communication with stakeholders will be daily/weekly to reinforce positive behaviors. The school RtI Specialist regularly collects data and provides feedback on the effectiveness of the school wide behavior system. PBIS team meet monthly with agendas and defined norms. Evidence
of high expectations is visible for stakeholders (signage, newsletters,website, marquee, ParentLinks). SEL curriculum will be integrated into the classrooms through diverse classroom libraries, Restorative Circles and
Frameworks/coaching materials that will be use daily in morning "Community Circles". Morning Meetings are consistently scheduled using effective social emotional resources that supports and expands learning opportunities for all students. RtI Specialist will oversee and provide individual and small groups, according to the Tiered level system, to support approximately 50 students in grades Pk-5 with a special emphasis of student in the ESSA group (Blacks, White, ELL, Hispanic, ESE and SWD).

Teachers will clearly communicate expectations and procedures while making personal connections with the students. A sense of urgency will be evident in all the classrooms. Teachers use strategies that encourage all students to participate in lessons (active thinking, discussions, cooperate learning, high-order thinking). Teachers will implement engagement and collaborative structures learned through the Kagan Professional Development. Teachers cultivate a learning orientation by encouraging effort, persistence and problem solving, systematically checking for student understanding, and providing feedback. Staff will work with students to create meaningful goals, track their personal data and monitor learning. Specific feedback is provided to all stakeholders on learning growth. Engagement and excitement will surround our actions and achievement.

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.

The school /teachers provides monthly opportunities for families to engage in activities that will enhance the learning of the students and communicate student progress to their families. All information is communicated in English and Spanish.

The school partners with PTA to provide activities for the families. Family Learning Nights are routinely scheduled with make and take activities to increase parent engagement. Teachers will communicate daily/ weekly through student agendas, quarterly parent contact folders and school/classroom newsletters. Conference nights are scheduled four times through the year, to allow the teachers time to share with families about their child's learning gains, progress and concerns. Whole school/classroom attendance will be monitored with fidelity. Strategies and interventions will be put in place to decrease tardies and improve daily attendance of students. Academic and Student Services staff are in place during and after school for students and parents to build relationships, to meet academic, emotional and physical needs. Student Services is present to meet with families regularly at school and for home visits, to assess and support needs of the families. Community connections are made available to support students and families with food, clothing and mentoring. Consultation with district Mental Health Counselors are available for ongoing support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$144,744.14
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$50,896.33
			Notes: Math Resource Salary facilitates planning , provides support and coaching for classroom teachers. Pulls skill specific small groups in grades 3-5 approximately 30 students per grade level. Provide professional development for staff			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$49,814.96
			Notes: RTI Salary Assists in the coordination of attendance, behavioral, and/or course performance/academic interventions at school site and for parents. Assists school administrators and staff in developing individual, class, and school-wide interventions, including data collection, analysis planning and interventions. Oversee and provide individual and small group support to approximately 50 students in grades Pk-5.			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,320.00
			Notes: Teachers will have data chats with resource teachers and administration. The teacher will have 2 days or four - 1/2 days out of the classroom per teacher. Knowledge gained will be used to make modifications to teaching practices			
	5100	510-Supplies	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,829.41
			Notes: Purchase consumable supplies such as pencils, glue, notebooks, copy paper, markers, chart paper, pens, ink, and file folders, flashcards to support 45 teachers (ELA, math and behavior resource and classroom teachers) and their approximately 380 PK-5 students.			
	5100	210-Retirement	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$4,310.92

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			Notes: Math Resource Retirement 8.47%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$3,155.57
			Notes: Math Resource FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$738.00
			Notes: Math Resource Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$259.57
			Notes: Math Resource Workers Comp .51%			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$9,670.30
			Notes: Math Resource Health Ins 19.0%			
	5100	210-Retirement	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$4,219.33
			Notes: RTI Retirement 8.47%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$3,088.53
			Notes: RTI FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$722.32
			Notes: RTI Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$254.06
			Notes: RTI Workers Comp .51%			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$9,464.84
			Notes: RTI Health Insurance 19.%			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**				**$6,605.70**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,605.70
			Notes: Provide additional reading, writing, math and science intervention during Saturday School Sessions to approximately 80 students, grades 3 to 5, to help make learning gains on FSA.			
					Total:	**$156,132.50**