

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Burnett Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Burnett Middle School

1010 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tarrelle Brooks

Start Date for this Principal: 1/29/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Burnett Middle School

1010 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 88% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 70% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Burnett Middle School will utilize data-driven decision making in order to implement research based instructional strategies that foster a safe climate & culture and provide the opportunity for students to achieve curriculum mastery.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Burnett Middle School will create an atmosphere that produces citizens who are present, accountable, work together and show respect, while preparing for college and/or career success.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Newton, Valerie | Principal | Progress monitoring of the school's comprehensive improvement plan. |
| Brooks, Tarrelle | Assistant Principal | Progress Monitoring of PBIS and School Culture Improvement Initiatives |
| Schlarbaum, Stacey | Assistant Principal | Progress Monitoring of Instruction and Curriculum |
| | SAC Member | SAC Chair |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/29/2019, Tarrelle Brooks

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.*

11

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 253 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 701 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 38 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 65 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 41 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 41 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 96 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 96 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 41 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Monday 6/29/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 203 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 759 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 77 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 92 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 102 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 128 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 340 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 120 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 203 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 759 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 77 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 92 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 102 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 128 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 340 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 120 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 36% | 51% | 54% | 35% | 50% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 41% | 52% | 54% | 44% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 47% | 47% | 35% | 45% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 33% | 55% | 58% | 36% | 54% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 41% | 57% | 57% | 49% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 52% | 51% | 42% | 51% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 28% | 47% | 51% | 39% | 47% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 57% | 67% | 72% | 53% | 66% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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 |
| 06 | 2019 | 33% | 53% | -20% | 54% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 52% | -15% | 52% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 52% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 51% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 36% | 53% | -17% | 56% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 58% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 55% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 48% | -25% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 37% | 62% | -25% | 54% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 61% | -24% | 54% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 10% | 31% | -21% | 46% | -36% |
| | 2018 | 7% | 29% | -22% | 45% | -38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 27% | 47% | -20% | 48% | -21% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 34% | 48% | -14% | 50% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 65% | -65% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 52% | 67% | -15% | 71% | -19% |
| 2018 | 52% | 65% | -13% | 71% | -19% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 63% | 63% | 0% | 61% | 2% |
| 2018 | 93% | 63% | 30% | 62% | 31% |
| Compare | | -30% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

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 | 14 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 32 | 33 | 12 | 27 | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 33 | 35 | 12 | 25 | 27 | 7 | 35 | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| ASN | | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 32 | 32 | 20 | 34 | 33 | 14 | 52 | 47 | | |
| HSP | 37 | 46 | 38 | 37 | 43 | 30 | 26 | 52 | 75 | | |
| MUL | 56 | 69 | | 50 | 37 | | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 38 | 26 | 39 | 45 | 50 | 40 | 60 | 57 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 40 | 35 | 31 | 40 | 36 | 25 | 54 | 58 | | |
| 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 | 11 | 33 | 29 | 9 | 28 | 29 | 15 | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 9 | 41 | 50 | 18 | 38 | 33 | 27 | 29 | | | |
| ASN | 42 | 58 | | 67 | 58 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 44 | 40 | 23 | 38 | 30 | 22 | 46 | 69 | | |
| HSP | 38 | 47 | 43 | 34 | 47 | 38 | 38 | 50 | 89 | | |
| MUL | 55 | 43 | | 41 | 62 | | | 54 | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 45 | 38 | 39 | 43 | 32 | 38 | 66 | 75 | | |
| FRL | 35 | 45 | 40 | 31 | 42 | 35 | 32 | 53 | 84 | | |
| 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 | 8 | 31 | 26 | 7 | 35 | 37 | 16 | 13 | | | |
| ELL | 5 | 32 | 39 | 15 | 35 | 27 | 10 | 29 | | | |
| ASN | 40 | 20 | | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | 37 | 29 | 21 | 43 | 45 | 17 | 46 | 81 | | |
| HSP | 37 | 45 | 31 | 37 | 50 | 37 | 50 | 49 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 48 | | 31 | 45 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 50 | 44 | 45 | 54 | 47 | 48 | 60 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 32 | 44 | 35 | 33 | 47 | 42 | 35 | 49 | 70 | | |

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 | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 80 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 447 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 30 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 30 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 showed the lowest performance overall was 8th Grade Math, with 10% of Burnett Middle School students scored a 3 or above. The primary contributing factor was identified as a lack of intensive math courses and support for level one and level two students.

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

Algebra I EOC scores decreased from 93% to 63% proficiency rates. This decline can be attributed to changes in scheduling standards that placed students of lower math and reading proficiency into Algebra I that would not have received this placement based on 2017-2018 scheduling standards. Students were all scheduled into Algebra Honors class, and master scheduling did not utilize the Algebra track that previously provided the research support course. In addition, the Algebra I instructor previously taught seventh grade math and did not have experience in the Algebra I curriculum. Students were offered tutoring before/after school and during lunch, however the majority of students chose not to utilize this additional support. Another contributing factor related to this decline in proficiency can be attributed to decreased student attendance rates.

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.

The data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 8th Grade Math, with a current proficiency level that is 36% below state average. The primary contributing factor was identified as a lack of intensive math courses and support for level one and level two students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 6th Grade Math, as evidenced by an 8% increase from 2018 to 2019. This increase can be attributed to increased teacher attendance and motivation to meet the needs of the students.

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

Based on 2018-2019 EWS data, three potential areas of concern include the following:
 8th grade math proficiency is currently at 10%, which is 36% below the state average
 Algebra proficiency decreased 30% from 2018 to 2019
 Science Achievement Decreased 7% from 2018 to 2019

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

1. In order to address academic deficiencies evidenced by 8th grade math proficiency of 10%, Burnett Middle School will employ content area specialists in order to enhance academic performance and school culture through instructional coaching and student interventions based on attendance, behavior, and curriculum indicators. These specialists include the following: Math Coach, Reading Coach, Science SAL, Language Arts SAL, Social Studies SAL and Student Success Coach.
2. Burnett Middle School will enhance the student and faculty culture and climate through the implementation of PBIS systems, restorative practices, and social emotional learning. PBIS protocols will be designed in a manner that reinforces student attendance, behavior, and curriculum.
3. Burnett Middle School instruction will focus on the educational philosophy of content mastery, allowing for the instructional autonomy necessary to individualize and differentiate instruction based on student assessment data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Math saw the most significant drop in performance out of all areas, specifically Algebra. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 90% proficiency on the Algebra EOC. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Progress monitoring includes a year long action plan with monthly targets and remediation as needed. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | This strategy will allow us to plan, monitor the plans progress, adapt monthly based on data and address individual students not meeting learning targets identified each month via ELP and tutorials. |
| Action Steps to Implement | |
| Yearly Department Action Plan w/ Math Coach, Angelique Diaz. | |
| Person Responsible | Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@hcps.net) |
| Monthly Action Plan w/ Math Coach, Angelique Diaz | |
| Person Responsible | Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@hcps.net) |

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of

Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Black/African American students did not meet the 41% threshold coming in at 32%; requiring this subgroup to be addressed in our SIP.

Measurable Outcome:

African American students at Burnett will increase their proficiency to 35%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@hcps.net)

Evidence- based Strategy:

The 4- subgroups identified as not meeting the threshold make up a large percentage of the school's overall population, therefore Tier 1 changes have been made. All Burnett students, regardless of FSA level, are placed in a reading course to support literacy. Placement in a reading course allows for ongoing progress monitoring by the Reading Coach and ELA SAL.

Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:

Progress monitoring with data-driven adjustments is proven to increase overall performance.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: ELL students did not meet the 41% threshold coming in at 30%; requiring this subgroup to be addressed in our SIP.

Measurable Outcome: ELL students at Burnett will increase their proficiency to 35%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The 4- subgroups identified as not meeting the threshold make up a large percentage of the school's overall population, therefore Tier 1 changes have been made. All Burnett students, regardless of FSA level, are placed in a reading course to support literacy. Placement in a reading course allows for ongoing progress monitoring by the Reading Coach and ELA SAL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring with data-driven adjustments is proven to increase overall performance

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Asian

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Asian students did not meet the 41% threshold coming in at 30%; requiring this subgroup to be addressed in our SIP.

Measurable Outcome: Asian students at Burnett will increase their proficiency to 35%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The 4- subgroups identified as not meeting the threshold make up a large percentage of the school's overall population, therefore Tier 1 changes have been made. All Burnett students, regardless of FSA level, are placed in a reading course to support literacy. Placement in a reading course allows for ongoing progress monitoring by the Reading Coach and ELA SAL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring with data-driven adjustments is proven to increase overall performance

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Students with Disabilities did not meet the 41% threshold coming in at 24%; requiring this subgroup to be addressed in our SIP.

Measurable Outcome:

Student with Disabilities at Burnett will increase their proficiency to 30%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

The 4- subgroups identified as not meeting the threshold make up a large percentage of the school's overall population, therefore Tier 1 changes have been made. All Burnett students, regardless of FSA level, are placed in a reading course to support literacy. Placement in a reading course allows for ongoing progress monitoring by the Reading Coach and ELA SAL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress monitoring with data-driven adjustments is proven to increase overall performance

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Instructional Priority #1: Burnett Middle School will increase course performance by using assessment data to plan and implement standard based instruction that supports student learning through unpacking standards, creating learning targets, using resources and reflecting on teaching practices.

Instructional Priority #2: Burnett Middle School will increase course performance by planning and utilizing a variety of rigorous student engagement strategies.

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.

Burnett Middle School will adhere to the school-wide PBIS/CHAMPS model in order to decrease overall discipline & create an ongoing student-centered positive environment that will lead to positive relationships, cultural sensitivity and high expectations for all.

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: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Asian | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |