

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Burns 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Burns Middle School

615 BROOKER RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mathew Diprima

Start Date for this Principal: 3/24/2014

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Burns Middle School

615 BROOKER RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[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	No	49%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

The students at Burns Middle School will acquire the attributes of good and successful citizens by becoming independent thinkers and problem solvers who exhibit honesty and integrity. They will practice personal responsibility, both towards other people and the environment. They will become life-long learners who contribute to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Burns Middle School students will become productive, responsible, and compassionate citizens.

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
DiPrima, Matthew	Principal	Leadership of School Improvement Team will monitor progress of Instructional Priority and provide a system of support and organization to meet desired goals.
Palmer, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	Support the Principal in development of a master schedule to meet the needs of all students.
Comas, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 3/24/2014, Mathew Diprima

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.*

5

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	391	447	414	0	0	0	0	1252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	14	26	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	55	51	0	0	0	0	114
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	59	65	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	65	0	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	52	66	0	0	0	0	157
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	79	70	0	0	0	0	204

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	2	23	36	0	0	0	0	61

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	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	430	412	490	0	0	0	0	1332
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	31	47	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	51	49	0	0	0	0	104
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	51	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	94	97	0	0	0	0	287

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	13	50	61	0	0	0	0	124

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	430	412	490	0	0	0	0	1332
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	31	47	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	51	49	0	0	0	0	104
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	51	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	94	97	0	0	0	0	287

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	13	50	61	0	0	0	0	124

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	61%	51%	54%	64%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	52%	54%	58%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	47%	45%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	55%	58%	71%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	57%	70%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	52%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	64%	47%	51%	66%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	67%	72%	87%	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	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	54%	6%	52%	8%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	51%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	49%	6%	55%	0%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	72%	62%	10%	54%	18%
	2018	71%	61%	10%	54%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	40%	31%	9%	46%	-6%
	2018	30%	29%	1%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	47%	14%	48%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	48%	10%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
2018	84%	65%	19%	71%	13%
Compare		-3%			
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
2018	95%	63%	32%	62%	33%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
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	31	52	43	39	49	44	39	48	70		

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
ELL	23	61	59	46	64	48	41	46			
ASN	58	80		81	76			92			
BLK	51	48	47	61	67	51	50	83	92		
HSP	52	56	46	63	65	52	61	80	78		
MUL	66	52	52	66	68	55	68	89	79		
WHT	66	56	39	74	68	52	68	80	90		
FRL	50	50	42	58	62	50	53	74	81		
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	27	42	34	31	41	33	22	65	73		
ELL	35	52	53	45	49	45	35	56			
ASN	72	68		85	69		64		100		
BLK	47	56	44	44	48	41	18	83	75		
HSP	61	57	50	65	61	46	51	79	87		
MUL	70	67	59	62	56	30	79	95	84		
WHT	71	59	47	73	68	45	68	92	93		
FRL	55	54	46	59	58	40	44	84	86		
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	21	38	37	28	47	43	19	63			
ELL	21	33	32	34	59	52	7	48			
ASN	91	87		91	88		88	91	100		
BLK	41	46	38	49	62	58	41	69	76		
HSP	53	53	38	63	66	51	58	78	88		
MUL	69	59	36	81	82	80	62	100	90		
WHT	70	60	49	76	71	49	70	92	90		
FRL	50	51	37	58	64	50	53	76	85		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	91
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	673

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	53
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	66
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	61
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.

With no state tests given last year we are continuing with the SIP plan using previous year's data. We will use various progress monitoring tools this year to evaluate student progress. Contributing factors to last year's low performance can be attributed to the Covid-19 pandemic. We saw students virtually for the final quarter of the semester and struggled with curriculum implementation, consistency and rigor. This year we are implementing a hybrid model of learning for students. The struggle to overcome the pandemic is still current and real. However, the expectations are much higher as we have systems in place to enhance consistency, rigor and progress monitoring.

The information followed is from 18-19 data. Overall ELA scores dropped from the previous year's data. We were a single digit percentage above the district and state averages instead of double digit percentage points above the district and state averages from the previous year. We have high achievement, but lower growth from the previous year. Contributing factors could have been personnel leaving after the semester break. Both teachers had students in the bottom quartile and in other sub groups. The ELA department also had a change in leadership with a new SAL appointed late in the year. A need for a more cohesive school wide writing plan was also recognized by teachers ELA and Reading teachers.

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

With no state tests given last year we are continuing with the SIP plan using previous year's data. We will use various progress monitoring tools this year to gauge student progress. The information followed is from 18-19 data. On the ELA FSA we scored below the district and state average for our bottom quartile. This sub-group scored above the district and state average in 2018. See above for possible factors contributing to the decline.

Burns had slightly declining scores on the Civics EOC. Although the scores were lower than the previous year they were still significantly higher compared to the district and state averages. Possible factors could range from a change in personnel from the previous year to increased "early warning signals" among our student population. This year we are making a concerted effort to have more grade level PLCs rather than whole department PLCs. We recognize the impact that high functioning PLCs have on student achievement.

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.

From previous data captured in FSA data from two years ago....Positive Gaps: Our math, science and social studies achievement gains were significantly higher than the state averages. The factors that contributed to all of the school's results are as follows: we have very professional and experienced teachers working together to better their student's understanding; the teacher's work tirelessly to find ways to make connections with kids and tie their understanding to expectations associated with the standards; there are many variables that we recognize are out of our control and focus our energy on the things we can control.

We also saw a huge increase on our 8th grade FSA achievement scores. Our math bottom quartile scores for the school were above the district however, we are still working at improving enough to beat the state average for 8th grade math. We did decrease the percentage points we were below the state to single digits. This improvement was a significant factor in our math success. Our math department led our school with using PLCs to break from traditional methods of math instruction. Student success was evident in observations; observers noted increased student use of collaborative skills to solve highly challenging real-world problems. Data was collected by the Instructional Leadership Team and shared with all.

Our ELA and Reading scores in many of the sub-groups increased and were as a direct result of improved curriculum, teacher practice through collaborative learning and purposeful practices that increased the relationships between teachers and students.

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

New Actions: A concentrated effort to use Professional Learning Communities to support teachers and students with their learning followed by observations, coaching, practice and reflection. Areas where we had stability, consistency and motivation to collaboratively work towards continuous improvement there was sustained growth of student collaborative discussion practices observed in classrooms.

Our SWDs had significant improvement in our Science Achievement results. We had new personnel that made a significant impact by collaborating together to support the various sub-groups. Every sub-group increased from the previous year in science. A huge leap was made by our African American population in science. And although we gained a whopping 10 percentage points in 8th grade math we are still below the state average. Our Math PLC collaborated and planned together to engage students using more student to student discussion techniques. We also implemented a Co-teach model with two general education teachers in two of our pre-algebra classes. We saw significant gains in all of our Math scores. All grade levels improved and overall the achievement gap closed a bit more from 2018 to 2019 at Burns. All of our subgroups were above the 41% threshold used by the federal government to target need areas for specific sub-groups. Our PLCs focused on sub-group data within their departments. African Americans, ELL, SWDs, Motivational Techniques, Bottom

Quartile and other student groups were identified early in the year and targeted to improve engagement and motivation.

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

An urgency to support our students who have been gravely affected by the pandemic is a major concern. The impact has been significant for our families as we have seen an increase in our Free and Reduced Rate percentage increase to almost 50%. The impact of the pandemic has had a financial impact for families which naturally causes other stress factors that could inhibit learning. Mental health supports will be needed as a result of increased anxiety. The switch from home learning to "face to face" learning has had its challenges for students and staff. The learning curve is great as we build the platform for the future. The challenges posed with learning new platforms for learning is stressful for everyone. Being cognizant and self-aware of natural anxieties that come with learning something new, during a pandemic nonetheless, need to be supported and acknowledged by all stakeholders. The fears associated with illness (physical, emotional or mental) can impact families in profound ways. Many of them we are still figuring out as we are acclimating to a new year and learning about our students and families.

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

1. Build high level academic discussion among and between students while incorporating growth mindset practices in all settings.
2. Provide a safe, caring and orderly environment
3. Monitor progress and provide feedback (use assessment FOR learning)
4. Support ALL students' social and emotional growth
5. Communicate with our community to create win-win solutions for all of our stakeholders

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Build high level academic discussion among and between students while incorporating growth mindset practices in all settings. Using Hattie's research we see there is strong correlation between rigorous discourse and student achievement data. We saw success when our math teacher incorporate discussion strategies with our bottom quartile. Our PLCs focused on using the Growth Mindset model to support structures with student discourse. The observation data from previous administrative observations saw a decline and then improvement last year with a focus on student discussion. The use of walk through data will help continue our collaborative work from last year.

Measurable Outcome:

We are looking at improving school achievement data in all sub-groups from the FSA sub-group data from two years ago.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew DiPrima (matthew.diprima@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Using discussion strategies that are varied to meet the needs of learners could and have included the use of Nearpod, discussion starters, open-ended question prompts for FSA style writing to support argument with data from the text, debates, Socratic Seminars are a few of our demonstrations for our eLearning students and brick and mortar students. We have also stressed the ideas established within the Growth Mindset model to build capacity with our students to work hard in the process of rigorous discussion.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

PLCs in each department came up with the strategies as a way to support the needs of students. Our instructional coaches supported implementation using demonstration classrooms, trainings and other support as identified by our Instructional Leadership Team. Our ILT monitors progress by meeting every two weeks to discuss ongoing feedback between a collection of data and actionable steps from the ILT(engine) and the PLCs.

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.

The following additions were included in last year's SIP and our PLCs will continue to pursue improvement with our instructional priority. However, we understand the fluid nature of our current environment which may impact us changing course as needed. We also acknowledge that the School Improvement Plan is a living document that can be amended as circumstances arise.

Social Studies - Teachers will use common vocabulary strategies and common assessments so that students can increase the fluency of high level classroom discourse among and between students.

ELA - Teachers will create a foundation for academic discussion among and between students.

Electives - Will implement Growth Mindset strategies within the classroom to increase engagement and promote constructive discourse.

Math - Will increase gains of level 1, 2 and 5 students by 2 percentage points thru facilitation of meaningful mathematical discourse.

Reading - In order to increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the FSA ELA, the reading team will build and maintain a "Growth Mindset" with our students and each other.

Science - Will seek PD to make content more relatable for the high level 2 reading so they can maximize their potential. We will do this through various strategies and resources focused on small group discussion techniques. We will increase student connections between the Nature of Science curriculum and the real-world; encouraging students to become well-rounded "Citizen Scientists".

PE - Will target the lower quartile of pacer test participants and will work towards building their fitness vocabulary, (cardiorespiratory fitness)goal attainment, student-student and student-teacher relationships through a "Growth Mindset Model" and class discussions.

Students Services will decrease their EWS students by providing support through RTI and other processes.

ASD Team - The ASD/IND Team will learn strategies to increase student communication.

School Tardy Policy

Tardy Policy

Tardy Consequences

Per quarter # of tardies

Parent Notification by Parent Link, add into Behavior Tracker 5-6

Conference with Guidance & Parent Link 7-9

Lunch Detention & Parent Link 10-11

Conference: Admin, Student & Parent 12

ISS, Parent notified by Admin 13+

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.

Systems are in place to communicate throughout the organization.

Teachers can communicate with the following groups to support learning:

Subject Area Leaders, Instructional Coaches, Content Supervisors - Content related learning processes, curriculum, instructional materials, strategies, PD

Team Leaders - Classroom management, Student Incentives, school wide issues

Student Services - Emotional Health and Mental Health Support, Promotional Requirements,

Steering - Concerns, budget recommendations

ILT - PLC facilitator and Professional Development support

Administration - Organization and Systems Support

Sunshine Committee - Culture

Positive Behavior Intervention Support Committee - Support positive school - wide incentives

New Teachers Support - Coach, buddy system

Communication - Email, Canvas, Parentlink, Phone calls

Student Government and other student clubs - Communication and student input

PTSA, SAC - Parental boards and community advisory groups to volunteer and provide input on school improvement

Other adhoc groups and committees to foster safety and support of the organization

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00