

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Burney Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

Burney Elementary School

901 S EVERS ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brooke Quinlan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

Burney Elementary School

901 S EVERS ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	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.

Provide a supportive and engaging learning environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lewis, Temeka	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will support the principal in enacting the action steps listed in our School Improvement Plan. The Assistant Principal will sit on the Academic Leadership, Student Services and ILT teams. The assistant principal will assist in monitoring academic and walkthrough data to support the principal in making adjustments to plans as necessary.
Sandoval, Maribel	Math Coach	The Math Coach will participate in the academic leadership team as well as the Instructional Leadership Team. The math coach will lead planning sessions that will result in teachers presenting rigorous standards-aligned lessons to students. The math coach will lead regular coaching cycles to improve the implementation of standards-aligned instruction, student discourse and engagement strategies. The math coach will monitor the effectiveness of these coaching cycles by disaggregating student data with administration and teacher teams. The math coach will support teachers by working with our students in the lowest-performing quartile.
Walsky, Kristen	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach will participate in the academic leadership team as well as the Instructional Leadership Team. The Reading Coach will lead planning sessions that will result in teachers presenting rigorous standards-aligned lessons to students. The Reading coach will lead regular coaching cycles to improve the implementation of standards-aligned instruction, student discourse and engagement strategies. The reading coach will monitor the effectiveness of these coaching cycles by disaggregating student data with administration and teacher teams. The math coach will support teachers by working with our students in the lowest-performing quartile.
Quinlan, Brooke	Principal	The principal will monitor the effectiveness of school-wide initiatives as listed in the school improvement plan. The principal will sit on the ALT, ILT and Student Services teams. The principal will provide feedback to all members of the leadership team to increase effectiveness of action steps.
Durant, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Brittany Durant will monitor the effectiveness of our school-wide behavior management plan at the Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 level. Ms. Durant will also provide regular coaching for teachers struggling with positive school culture at the Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. Ms. Durant will share Tier 1 behavior data with the administrative and student service leadership teams as well as teacher teams. Ms. Durant will support the implementation of our Response to Intervention process on a daily basis through fidelity checks.
Holbrook, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Amanda Holbrook will monitor the effectiveness of our Response to Intervention Plan. Ms. Holbrook will also provide coaching for teachers struggling with implementation Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Ms. Holbrook will support the implementation of our Response to Intervention process on a daily basis through fidelity checks. Ms. Holbrook will pull ELA LPQ students 3 times per week to to provide Tier 3 intervention.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/10/2021, Brooke Quinlan

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

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

330

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

2

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

1

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	57	54	50	60	53	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	18	13	12	14	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	34	42	27	45	29	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

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	18	13	12	14	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/10/2021

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	45	48	50	54	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	12	15	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	45	48	50	54	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	12	15	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				27%	52%	57%	35%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				35%	55%	58%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	50%	53%	61%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	54%	63%	44%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	57%	62%	68%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	46%	51%	65%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				22%	50%	53%	43%	51%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	21%	55%	-34%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	54%	-28%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading- EOY View

iReady Math-EOY View

Science Formative-% of students above 50%

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	10	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	10	25
	Students With Disabilities	10	8	17
	English Language Learners	7	7	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	6	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	6	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	25
	English Language Learners	0	7	20
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2	8	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	5
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	4	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	10	11
	Students With Disabilities	5	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	6	13

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	13	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	8	23
	Students With Disabilities	6	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	0	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5	3	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	4	8
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	3	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	2	15
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	14

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	4	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	5	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	3	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	2	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15		50
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15		50
	Economically Disadvantaged			

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	10	38		12	30						
ELL	29	52		25	24		25				
BLK	18	35		12	26		17				
HSP	35	52		28	28		21				
WHT	43			29							
FRL	29	40	40	22	27	43	14				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	6	24	33	16	23	14	9				
ELL	24	27		41	51	38	6				
BLK	22	39	38	25	37		8				
HSP	28	32	36	46	51	50	23				

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
WHT	36			38	40						
FRL	27	35	39	40	46	32	22				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	45		24	63	60					
ELL	21	48	55	36	57						
BLK	32	29		35	76						
HSP	35	55	57	43	68		37				
WHT	40			63							
FRL	35	49	61	44	70	65	43				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	32
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	22
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	36
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?

The students at Burney Elementary struggle to show mastery of grade level content. When looking at gains in proficiency, our ELL students typically out-perform our non-ELL students.

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

Student proficiency in Mathematics has the greatest need for improvement. While Mathematics is lower, Reading Proficiency does not meet school, district or state goals.

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

According to trend data taken during state walks, rigor of questions and tasks presented of students was trending towards grade level, but wasn't regularly seen during all walkthroughs. This leads to gaps in understanding of grade-level concepts.

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

Science is the area that has continued to be stable at Burney Elementary.

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

Highly Effective 5th grade teachers during the 108-2019 school year.

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

Teachers will be needed to provided with time to internalize standards, understanding all facets of the standard as well as how it is most adequately assessed in a classroom setting. Students will need to be provided with appropriate and rigorous scaffolding so teachers do not retreat into prior-grade standards.

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.

Teachers will participate in standards internalization sessions monthly. Coaches and administrators will also provide every teacher with a 10-day coaching cycle on either: student engagement or classroom discourse. Monthly mini-professional development sessions will be held in order to support these coaching cycles.

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

Through the use of coaching cycles, coaches and administrators will build teacher leadership. Through the use of common discourse and engagement strategies we will also build student capacity that can be carried into the following school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Area of Focus Description: All teachers K-5 will participate in monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.

Rationale: During the 2020-2021 school year, 17% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Math Diagnostic and 19% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic. This data shows a significant number of students at Burney are working below grade level.

According to recent trend data from the Bureau of School improvement along with classroom walk-through data and informal/formal observation data, learning tasks designed by teachers did not always meet grade level standards due to over-scaffolding.

Student Outcomes:

In the 2021-2022 school year,

50% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.

30% of 3rd-5th grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.

39% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.

30% of 3rd-5th students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.

Measurable Outcome:

55% of 5th grade students will be proficient on the Mid-Year Science Assessment.

During classroom walk-throughs, 75% of students will be independently working on grade level learning tasks aligned to standards in reading, math and science or working in a small group with the teacher.

Teacher Outcomes:

In the 2021-2022 school year,

All teachers K-5 will participate in monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.

Student Outcomes:

Math and Reading iReady data will be monitored through Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring 6 times per school year (3 diagnostics and 3 growth monitoring).

PENDA Learning will serve as a progress monitoring tool for science. 55% of students will reach mastery on lessons aligned to taught standards.

Monitoring: Teachers, Students, Instructional Coaches, RTI Resource Teachers, Title One Paras, and Administration will monitor this data.

Teacher Outcomes:

Teachers will sign-in to show attendance during monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions.

Teachers will receive 3-4 classroom walk-throughs over a two-week time period from

Admin and Instructional Coaches. At the conclusion of the walk-through period, teachers will be given specific feedback on current trends and next steps in relation to their task/question alignment.

Teachers will bring completed student standards-aligned learning tasks to monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions to review student work and trends amongst the grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will participate in monthly standard internalization sessions (subs will be provided) as well as weekly collaborative planning sessions aligned to B.E.S.T. or Florida Standards as applicable so they can deliver on-grade level instruction to students. VE and ELL Resource Teachers will attend these sessions and plan specific strategies for those groups of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The number of students who are showing mastery of standards decreased since 2018-2019. Teachers need additional time to plan discussion questions and independent tasks that will allow students to work within grade-level standards. Our VE, Economically Disadvantaged, Black, Hispanic, ELL and White were below 41% proficiency across all assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaches will meet with Administration prior to internalization and lesson planning to ensure all agendas, materials etc. are prepared for teachers. Agendas will be sent out to teachers 5 days in advance.

Person Responsible

Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will come to planning prepared with knowledge of the ALDs, Item Specs, and instructional strategies for the standards listed on the agenda. The teachers will also preview any materials successfully needed to participate in the planning sessions.

Person Responsible

Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Each grade level will plan for:

1. Which instructional strategy best aligns to the standard and will be modeled/referenced by the classroom teacher.
2. Which problems/portions of the text will be teacher-led and which problems/portions will be done independently for feedback and monitoring with emphasis on choosing tasks and problems that reach the higher levels of the ALDs (if applicable)
3. 2-3 questions to promote student thinking and discussion per day.
4. Task(s) and success criteria that will be used for formative assessment and feedback.
5. Assignments from Blended Learning Platforms (Penda, iReady, Achieve3000) that will be used as instructional tools.
6. Look-fors for unit of instruction if applicable.
7. A second day of small group planning will occur to ensure that the needs are being met for each subgroup.

Person Responsible

Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement commonly planned components in their classrooms and will collect data from formative assessments to bring to monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions to review student work and

trends amongst the grade level. During data chats, specific subgroups: SWD, Black, Hispanic, ELL, White, Economically Disadvantaged will be discussed.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will utilize formative assessment data in future lesson planning and to determine student progress towards mastering grade level standards. They will share Tier 1 data monthly with Response to Intervention Resource Teachers to plan for specific interventions and help for planning acceleration.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions identified by RTI Coaches during monthly meetings to help bridge the gap so they may accelerate their learning and begin to access grade level standards.

Person Responsible Brittany Durant (brittany.durant@hcps.net)

Teachers and RTI Coaches will implement Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions using Measuring Up and LLI curriculum. Tier 2 & Tier 3 lists will be modified monthly during RTI meetings to ensure the appropriate students are receiving the resource.

Person Responsible Brittany Durant (brittany.durant@hcps.net)

Fidelity of Tier 1 instruction will be monitored through walkthroughs using the 4-pillars.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Leadership team members will review the progress of all subgroups after each core assessment (iReady, Achieve3000, MidYear Assessments) to determine progress towards reaching 41% proficiency.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**Area of Focus**

During the 2020-2021 school year, 17% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Math Diagnostic and 19% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic. This data shows a significant number of students at Burney are working below grade level.

Description and Rationale:

According to recent trend data from the Bureau of School improvement along with classroom walk-through data and informal/formal observation data, learning tasks designed by teachers did not always meet grade level standards due to over-scaffolding by teachers. In addition, some questions were of appropriate rigor, but discussion protocols were not seen consistently. This data indicates a need to increase teacher content knowledge and pedagogy through instructional coaching.

Student Outcomes:

In the 2021-2022 school year,

50% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.

30% of 3rd-5th grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.

Measurable Outcome:

39% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.

30% of 3rd-5th students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.

55% of 5th grade students will be proficient on the Mid-Year Science Assessment.

During classroom walk-throughs, 75% of students will be independently working on grade level learning tasks aligned to standards in reading, math and science or working in a small group with the teacher.

Teacher Outcomes:

During classroom walk-throughs, 50% of teachers will appropriately release learning tasks and provide feedback to students to increase student engagement or will utilize a discussion protocol by end of October 2021; 75% of teachers by end of April 2022.

Student Outcomes:

Math and iReady data will be monitored through Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring 6 times per school year (3 diagnostics and 3 growth monitoring).

Teachers, Students, Instructional Coaches, Title One Paras, and Administration will monitor this data.

Monitoring:

Teacher Outcomes:

Instructional Coaches and Administration will share percentage of teachers who have completed a 10-day coaching cycle by the end of each month. All homeroom teachers will participate in a 10-day coaching cycle by December 2021.

75% of teachers will see an increase in their trend data after their coaching cycle based on pre-determined look-fors.

Person responsible for

Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

**monitoring
outcome:**

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Teachers will complete 10-day coaching cycles on either gradual release to increase student engagement or classroom discussion protocols.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Based on classroom walk-through observations and formal/informal observations, 75% of feedback given to teachers indicated the need to increase student engagement through feedback on planned rigorous learning tasks aligned to standard and/or incorporating classroom discussion protocols amongst students. Evidence showed that most classrooms were teacher led with little discussion amongst students during whole group and small group instruction. Students also showed a lack of engagement while independently completing learning tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will select their area of focus for their 10-day coaching cycle by September 2021.

Person Responsible Temeka Lewis (temeka.lewis@hcps.net)

Math Coach will determine a two-week window to plan for a model, co-teach and observation 10-day coaching cycle for each assigned teacher.

Person Responsible Maribel Sandoval (maribel.sandoval@hcps.net)

ELA Coach will determine a two-week window to plan for a model, co-teach and observation 10-day coaching cycle for each assigned teacher.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Walkthroughs will be completed by administrators using the 4 pillars. Feedback will be offered each Friday or at the end of a coaching cycle as applicable.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2020-2021 school year, 17% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Math Diagnostic and 19% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic. Due to COVID-19 many parent involvement events were postponed or held virtually.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>In the 2021-2022 school year 50% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 school year 30% of 3rd-5th grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 school year 39% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 school year 30% of 3rd-5th students will be proficient according to iReady Math Spring Diagnostic.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 school year 55% of 5th grade students will be proficient on the Mid-Year Science Assessments.</p> <p>40% of parents will attend at-least one parent involvement night.</p> <p>Students who attend Parent Involvement night will see a 5% increase in their iReady scale score in both reading and math.</p>
Monitoring:	Students who complete the at-home Literacy Component will see a 5% increase in their iReady Scale Score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Academic Parent Nights focusing on student data and at-home research based activities such as Scholastic Storyworks and blended learning platforms (PENDA, iReady, Achieve3000).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Less than 50% of our students made their typical growth according to iReady in both Reading and Math across the majority of grade levels. Parents can learn strategies for at-home programs that will help bridge gaps in learning caused by COVID-19.
Action Steps to Implement	
Community Engagement committee will select 4 dates based on parent survey. Each date will focus on one activity for ELA, one activity for Math and one activity for SEL by end of August 2021.	
Person Responsible	Temeka Lewis (temeka.lewis@hcps.net)
Community Engagement committee will work with instructional coaches and RTI personnel to choose data to discuss and researched based materials that parents may use at home with their children. Using classroom supplies, each parent will go home with a make-and-take bag filled with activities and materials so they can replicate this learning at home.	
Person Responsible	Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Administration will advertise events with advance notice for parents via paper, social media, and parentlink.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Data from events will be collected 4 times per year.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Area of Focus Description: All K-5 ELA teachers will participate in monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.</p> <p>Rationale: During the 2020-2021 school year, 19% of students were on grade level according to Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic. This data shows a significant number of students at Burney are working below grade level in reading.</p> <p>According to recent trend data from the Bureau of School Improvement along with classroom walk-through data and informal/formal observation data, learning tasks designed by teachers did not always meet grade level standards.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Student Outcomes: In the 2021-2022 school year, 50% of K-2 grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic. 30% of 3rd-5th grade students will be proficient according to iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic.</p> <p>During classroom walk-throughs, 75% of students will be independently working on grade level learning tasks aligned to standards in reading or working in a small group with the teacher.</p> <p>Teacher Outcomes: In the 2021-2022 school year,</p> <p>All teachers K-5 will participate in monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions to increase teacher reading content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.</p> <p>During classroom walk-throughs, 75% of students will be independently working on grade level learning tasks aligned to standards in reading or working in a small group with the teacher.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Teacher Outcomes: In the 2021-2022 school year,</p> <p>All K-5 ELA teachers will participate in monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions and weekly grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Kristen Walsky (kristen.walksy@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers will participate in monthly standard internalization sessions (subs will be provided) as well as weekly collaborative planning sessions aligned to B.E.S.T. or Florida Standards as applicable so they can deliver on-grade level instruction in reading to students.</p>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The number of students who are showing mastery of ELA standards decreased since 2018-2019. Teachers need additional time to plan discussion questions and independent tasks that will allow students to work within grade-level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaches will meet with Administration prior to internalization and lesson planning to ensure all agendas, materials etc. are prepared for teachers. Agendas will be sent out to teachers 5 days in advance.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will come to planning prepared with knowledge of the ALDs, Item Specs, and instructional strategies for the standards listed on the agenda. The teachers will also preview any materials successfully needed to participate in the planning sessions.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Each grade level will plan for:

1. Which instructional strategy best aligns to the standard and will be modeled/referenced by the classroom teacher.
2. Which portions of the text will be teacher-led and which portions will be done independently for feedback and monitoring with emphasis on choosing tasks that reach the higher levels of the ALDs (if applicable)
3. 2-3 questions to promote student thinking and discussion per day.
4. Task(s) and success criteria that will be used for formative assessment and feedback.
5. Assignments from Blended Learning Platforms (iReady, Achieve3000) that will be used as instructional tools.
6. Look-fors for unit of instruction if applicable.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement commonly planned components in their classrooms and will collect data from formative assessments to bring to monthly lesson internalization PLC sessions to review student work and trends amongst the grade level.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will utilize formative assessment data in future lesson planning and to determine student progress towards mastering grade level standards. They will share Tier 1 data monthly with Response to Intervention Resource Teachers to plan for specific interventions and help for planning acceleration.

Person Responsible Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions identified by RTI Coaches during monthly meetings to help bridge the gap so students may accelerate their learning and begin to access grade level standards.

Person Responsible Brittany Durant (brittany.durant@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Burney elementary is considered in the "very high" range for violent incidents averaging 2.7 incidents per 100 children.

As part of Burney's plan, school-wide CHAMPs will be used. Clear, concise expectations will be created for each public area. Teachers will also implement CHAMPs as part of their daily classroom instruction. Burney will embed practices and language from the Seven Mindsets during our SEL instruction provided by both the classroom teacher and the School Counselor. In addition, Burney Elementary will implement PBIS, using a token economy to encourage positive behaviors inside and outside the classroom. Classroom teachers will be responsible for turning PBIS data into the Title 1 Para or RTI Resource Teacher assigned to their grade level. Results of the points will be displayed by grade level on the morning show Monday of each week.

The Student Services Team, in conjunction with administration, will complete classroom walkthroughs focused on the implementation of CHAMPs and PBIS. We will also monitor behavior tracker data on a monthly basis and provide proactive measures such as counseling, teacher coaching, and behavior plans as necessary to students who are displaying warning signs.

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.

Burney Elementary School takes a proactive approach to building a positive school culture. As part of our Tier 1 systems, Burney teachers utilize the PBIS system. Throughout the day, students are eligible to earn up to 15 Burney Bucks for appropriately following our school wide expectations also known as, The Burney Bs:

-Be Safe, Be a Problem Solver, Be Responsible, Be Motivated, Be Respectful

Students can spend these bucks on classroom prizes, at schoolwide events or at the school store.

In order to build the culture, we are asking that the student choose the incentives through classroom surveys. Not only will this build buy in, but it will also build excitement towards the event.

The fidelity and implementation of our PBIS system is monitored by our Response to Intervention teacher, who is the leader of our PBIS team. This Team will meet monthly to review Tier 1 PBIS data including behavior tracker data and attendance at PBIS events etc.

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

Teachers and Staff at Burney Elementary School will promote positive culture for students by using Class-Dojo for our Tier I system. Teachers will reward students with points as they comply to our Burney B's. As students collect points, they have the opportunity to spend their points in their classroom, monthly PBIS event, or pop-up events. Parents also have the ability to login to their parent portal daily to see how many points their child has earned, followed by comments from the classroom teacher. In order to keep students excited with the monthly events, stakeholders, and staff have help contribute items to the school store as well.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$74,663.67
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	520-Textbooks	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$742.82
			<i>Notes: Purchase math intervention books Measuring Up to support small group instruction. Teachers and RTI Coaches will implement Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions using Measuring Up.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$53,711.30
			<i>Notes: *Rtl Resource Teacher will implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions using Measuring Up and LLI curriculum. Tier 2 and Tier 3 lists will be modified monthly during Rtl meetings to ensure the appropriate students are receiving support. The position will begin September 1, 2021-August 31, 2022.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,811.56
			<i>Notes: *Rtl Resource Teacher Retirement 10.82%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,330.10
			<i>Notes: *Rtl Resource Teacher FICA 6.20%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$778.81
			<i>Notes: *Rtl Resource Teacher Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,015.15
			<i>Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Health and Life Insurance 19%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$273.93
			<i>Notes: *Rtl Resource Teacher Workers Comp .51%</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$69,542.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$50,400.12

			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher will conduct professional develop trainings for staff, facilitate planning, provide support and coaching for classroom teachers. The Math Resource Teacher will pull specific small groups in grades 3-5 for approximately 30 students per grade level			
	5100	210-Retirement	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,453.29
			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Retirement 10.82%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,124.81
			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher FICA 6.20%			
	5100	220-Social Security	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$730.80
			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$9,576.02
			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Health and Life Insurance 19%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0641 - Burney Elementary School	UniSIG		\$257.04
			Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Workers Comp .51%			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$151,620.00