Burnett Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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.](http://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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newton, Valerie	Principal	Ms. Newton directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of a middle or a career center public school site. She demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards. Ms. Newton is the lead administrator for the following departments - Social Studies & Electives
Brooks, Tarrelle	Assistant Principal	Dr. Brooks, will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a middle school Dr. Brooks is the lead administrator for the following departments - Literacy
Schlarbaum, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Schlaurbaum will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a middle school Mrs. Schlaurbaum is the lead administrator for the following departments - Mathematics & Science
Holland, Yvonne	SAC Member	SAC Chair The chairperson shall work closely with the principal and executive committee to plan each meeting and establish an agenda and preside at all meetings of the School Advisory Council and may sign all letters, reports, and other School Advisory Council communication.

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.*
0

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
7

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	188	221	264	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	82	103	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	31	59	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	12	6	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	26	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	53	45	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	79	60	0	0	0	0	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	56	0	0	0	0	150

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	19	17	34	0	0	0	0	70

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	45	48	40	0	0	0	0	133
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	77	93	0	0	0	0	228

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				36%	51%	54%	37%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				41%	52%	54%	46%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	47%	47%	41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				33%	55%	58%	34%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				41%	57%	57%	44%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	52%	51%	35%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				28%	47%	51%	35%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				57%	67%	72%	55%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	36%	53%	-17%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2021					
	2019	10%	31%	-21%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	63%	63%	0%	61%	2%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Reading: Achieve 3000
Math: Baseline/Midyear
Civics: Baseline/MIdyear
Science: Baseline/MIdyear

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	14	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	10	10
	Students With Disabilities	10	11	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	39	
	Students With Disabilities	27	38	
	English Language Learners	21	32	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	16	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	12	12
	Students With Disabilities	15	20	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	37	
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	36	
	Students With Disabilities	32	37	
	English Language Learners	12	37	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	31	39	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	38	
	Students With Disabilities	32	43	
	English Language Learners	26	20	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	22	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	19	20
	Students With Disabilities	19	24	26
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	45	
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	44	
	Students With Disabilities	26	44	
	English Language Learners	27	26	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	38	
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	41	
	Students With Disabilities	29	41	
	English Language Learners	20	23	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	17	21	16	27	44	15	24			
ELL	19	30	28	14	20	23	6	24			
BLK	17	26	26	13	26	36	9	31	47		
HSP	32	32	26	23	26	37	20	47	64		
MUL	35	29	20	25	36		64				
WHT	39	36	21	30	26	29	35	48	52		
FRL	26	29	24	19	26	37	19	40	50		
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			
ASN				30							

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	24

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across all grade levels, a decrease in proficiency is evident in all data points, all subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

All data points demonstrate a great need for improvement overall.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Inconsistencies in progress monitoring processes, change of leadership team, numerous instructional vacancies.
A cohesive leadership team, stronger systems of progress monitoring and classroom walkthroughs, utilize district support (DRTs)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

None, all data points were stagnant or decreased. However, we did experience a decrease in discipline referrals.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Positive Behavior Management Plan (PBIS), improved MTSS/RTI procedures, and a variety of strategies and interventions used to support students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

New leadership team: Literacy Coach, Teacher Leader, SALs for Math and Science.
Walkthrough Schedule that allows for stronger classroom presence and feedback to teachers.
Data from walkthroughs used to drive what happens in PLCs to assist teachers in planning for engaging lessons.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly school wide professional development based on walkthrough data (required)
Weekly lunch and learn professional development based on walkthrough data and teacher requests (voluntary)

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Weekly admin and monthly leadership team meetings to assess impact, progress, and efficiency of our systems and to modify as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School Wide Literacy focus based on that only 30% (a decline of 6%) of our students are proficient in ELA. In addition, Science and Civics also decreased in proficiency 6 and 14 percentage points respectively. It is our belief that literacy is the reason for the decrease across all subject areas and a focus on school wide literacy will result in growth cross curricular. Targeted small groups for in class support and ELP tutoring (before school, during lunch, and during Saturday Academy) include Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Asian, and Black/African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	Literacy At least 75% of students will increase their reading and written communication by a minimum of 5 points as demonstrated on the Spring 2022 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Curriculum Formative Assessments: Springboard Unit Embedded Assessments Paths Mid-Unit Assessments Paths End-of-Unit Assessments Other formatives: Homework, text-dependent questions, teacher-made quizzes, student observations, reflections and/or conversations with students, exit slips. District Formatives: District's Baseline Reading Assessment District's Mid-Year Reading Assessment EOY Reading Assessment Writing Baseline Assessment Writing Mid-Year Assessment Writing EOY Assessment Semester Exams BrightFish Achieve 3000
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tarrelle Brooks (tarrelle.brooks@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Building strong readers and writers through the use of accelerated literacy instruction with core curriculum, effective literacy strategies, differentiated instruction, scaffolding, small grouping, and data. Students will improve reading, writing, language, listening/speaking skills through implementation of core curriculum with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Working in conjunction with HCPS Academic Services, these are the strategies the district has selected to improve student performance.
Action Steps to Implement	

Teachers will improve classroom instruction of core curriculum using the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.

Teachers will design and implement instruction that uses formal and informal assessment instruments to meet the needs of every learner.

Literacy Committee to promote literacy-rich environment. Use of data/ literacy anchor charts displayed in common areas,

Literacy teachers will develop goals quarterly to improve

Literacy Coach to facilitate cross-curricular professional learning opportunities with focus on key Reading and Writing strategies.

Literacy teachers can choose to participate in quarterly learning walks to observe peer instruction.

Support RTI team with their use of Tier 3 interventions for bottom quartile students.

Implement coaching cycles as needed.

Person Responsible   Tarrelle Brooks (tarrelle.brooks@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency has experienced a steady decline over the past few years prior to the pandemic, however, a more significant decline has occurred in MS Acceleration which is our Algebra classes. Because of this our 2nd area of focus is Math with an emphasis on Algebra. Targeted small groups for in class support and ELP tutoring (before school, during lunch, and during Saturday Academy) include Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Asian, and Black/African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will implement common Instructional Frameworks (with a focus on small group instruction) throughout all grade levels. The math department will utilize progress monitoring assessments to identify and remedy individual students' unfinished learning to improve our Achievement Points by 5% from 2021.
Monitoring:	District provided progress monitoring assessments for each unit of study.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Frameworks (provided by the district)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown the effectiveness of utilizing small groups to address the specific day-to-day data based needs of each student.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs 2x a month to discuss data and plan lessons.

Math DRT will be on campus once a week to participate in PLC discussions and to provide coaching to teachers as needed based on walk-through data.

2nd Math DRT will be on campus biweekly to provide coaching to teachers as well as co-teach and/or model as needed.

Small group tutoring will be available before school, during lunches and one Saturday a month to target specific standards.

Person Responsible	Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Burnett Middle School will implement schoolwide social and emotional learning strategies, restorative practices, PBIS positive behavior intervention systems, consistent communication, solution-based strategies, and positive relationships to strengthen the peer culture.

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.

Burnett Middle School will implement schoolwide social and emotional learning strategies, restorative practices, PBIS positive behavior intervention systems, consistent communication, solution-based strategies, and positive relationships to strengthen the peer culture.

In addition, each staff will sponsor a student club based on their personal interest to allow them to connect with students more than just academically. Once a month, a club day schedule will be utilized for students to meet with the club of their choice. The goal is building positive relationships between faculty and students outside of the classroom.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Every one on campus contributes to the positive culture and environment, however, the PBIS team under the leadership of the APA and Success Coach working with the Culture and Climate Committee, oversee and monitor the progress by regularly analyzing behavior data and surveying faculty and students.

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00