

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Burnett Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Burnett Middle School

1010 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Tarrelle Brooks**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Burnett Middle School

1010 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">71%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D	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.**

Everybody learns everyday!

**Provide the school's vision statement.:**

Burnett Middle School will foster a learning environment that motivates students to reach their maximum potential.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brooks, Tarrelle	Principal	<p>Dr. Brooks directs and coordinates all educational, administrative, counseling and safety activities of a middle school site. He demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader and develops and evaluates the Instructional Leadership Team to ensure academic standards are in place and in concordance with state, national and school board expectations.</p> <p>Dr. Brooks is the lead administrator for Math &amp; Science.</p>
Brown, Jennifer4	SAC Member	<p>The SAC chair works closely with the principal and Instructional Leadership Team to plan meetings and establish agendas for all SAC meetings. The chair may document and sign all letters, reports and other school advisory.</p>
Bubley, Alexandria	Assistant Principal	<p>Ms. Bubley's role is Student Affairs and Safety. She has the responsibility to ensure all students on campus are safe and follow all school and classroom rules and procedures. The effectiveness of this role direct impact instruction in the way that students who are interfering with the learning process must be corrected and provided restorative practices in order to be re-entered back into the classroom to receive high quality instruction.</p>

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2022, Tarrelle Brooks

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

43

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

701

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

8

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

7

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	247	253	201	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	38	52	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	65	86	0	0	0	0	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	41	32	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	41	32	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	47	58	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	72	0	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":



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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/31/2022

**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	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

**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	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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	50%	50%				36%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	35%						41%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						33%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	24%	36%	36%				33%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	40%						41%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						37%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	52%	53%				28%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	58%	58%				57%	67%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	53%	-17%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2022					
	2019	10%	31%	-21%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	63%	63%	0%	61%	2%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	34	36	14	35	46	14	47			
ELL	20	38	42	17	35	41	15	55			
BLK	21	28	33	18	38	42	11	52			
HSP	27	37	38	22	38	50	17	60	70		
MUL	27	32		36	40						
WHT	32	40	43	32	44	54	25	74	73		
FRL	23	33	37	20	38	48	11	56	54		
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		

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
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							
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		

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
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	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?**

All content areas made gains except, 8th grade Science and 8th grade ELA. Bottom Quartile students made significant gains.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

The greatest need for improvement lies in 8th grade Science and 8th grade ELA.

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

Lack of classroom management, excessive teacher absence due to medical issues, low attendance by students and teacher-student relationships. New actions taken placed are: low performing teachers were removed from the grade level, Teacher Lead to coach new staff with classroom management strategies, ongoing on-site PD in content specific areas.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The most improved content area was Civics and Algebra 1 students.

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

Both teachers in the content areas taught engaging content every single day. High expectations for learning, consistent parent communication (positive and constructive). Students wanted to learn because of positive relationships built by the teachers.

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

unique scheduling of students, continuous progress monitoring, Strong data-driven PLCs

**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.**

Weekly Lunch-n-Learn sessions during all 3 lunches, Monthly School-wide PD, weekly and bi-weekly demo lessons.

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

Extended Learning Program, Saturday Academy, 18 minute tutoring sessions 2X/week by classroom teachers

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

Literacy (Reading & Writing)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Rationale  
 30% of 6th grade students earned a 3 or higher on the Spring 2022 ELA FSA, compared to 27% the previous year. 28% of 7th grade students scored a 3 or higher on the Spring 2022 ELA FSA, compared to 24% the previous year. Only 22% of 8th grade students earned a 3 or higher on the Spring 2022 ELA FSA, compared to 32% the previous year.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

A minimum of 75% of Burnett students will improve by at least 5 percentage points from the F.A.S.T. PM1, September 2022 to F.A.S.T. PM3, May 2023.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

District formatives, Baseline assessments, Achieve3000, BEST PM1, PM2, Pm3

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tarrelle Brooks (tarrelle.brooks@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Use of the following:  
 • District’s text-based writing progress monitoring tool  
 • Florida StudySync’s Benchmark Forms (BOY, MOY, EOY)  
 • Study Sync’s end-of-unit assessments  
 • F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring assessments 1,2,and 3

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The rationale for selecting the above evidence-based strategies is for all content-area teachers to be equipped with the skills, tools, and knowledge they will need to ensure the employment of instructional practices that allow students to learn. Reading and Writing content through engaging texts and tasks.

**Action Steps to Implement**  
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monthly Coach facilitated Lunch-n-Learn to provide cross-curricular reading and writing strategies to teachers.

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

Monthly “Saturday Academy” tutorial sessions. Provide remedial StudySync “spotlight skill” lessons and feedback to a targeted group.

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

Facilitate robust, bi-weekly PLCs to include protocols for:  
 • Analyzing progress monitoring data, analyzing student work, unit planning, lesson planning, lesson planning for teacher-led small

groups, designing progress monitoring, professional goal setting, and professional skill building.

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

Use of StudySync Assessment Cycle which includes F.A.S.T.-style assessment questions and a diagnostic, benchmark assessment, instruction and formative assessment, review, E-O-U assessment, and test-prep/ practice.

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

cheduled demonstration classroom rotations to offer real-time examples of instructional practices. Teachers will be provided substitute teachers for the class periods they will miss, per admin.

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Burnett’s Math achievement Score is 31% (+5)

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

- 6th Grade FSA percentage of proficiency 22% (+3)
- 7th Grade FSA percentage of proficiency 10% (+7)
- 8th Grade FSA percentage of proficiency 28% (+10)
- Algebra Baseline EOC percentage of proficiency 71% (+10)

**Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Teachers will implement common Instructional Frameworks (with a focus on small group instruction) throughout all grade levels. The math department will automate progress monitoring assessments to identify and remedy individual students’ unfinished learning to improve our Achievement Points 5% from 2022.

**Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Automated Progress Monitoring: Each teacher has been provided the support and resources to have our students to utilize the district provided online applications IXL, EDGEMS and Big Ideas. This data will be pulled as content for our PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tarrelle Brooks (tarrelle.brooks@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Frameworks Integration: Our district coach will work with our team to continue the implementation techniques, strategies, and skills. Utilize the district provided online applications IXL, EDGEMS and Big Ideas

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

These strategies are implemented district-wide because they have been proven to work best for academic math performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**  
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SAL will conduct Walk-Thrus to facilitate Frameworks Integration, and ensure appropriate pacing and remediation

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

Focus will be placed on the development of teacher-led, blended learning, and independent work – and whole group remediation as warranted by the standard.

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

## **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Burnett Middle School will implement 7 mindset strategies, school-wide PBIS, restorative practices and increase family engagement in order to strengthen school culture.

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

All staff and students on campus contribute to the positive culture, climate and school environment. The PBIS and 7 Mindsets team is under the leadership of the APA and Success Coach. They work together to build culture and community among students. The School Leadership Team (SLT), consists of Counselors, Admin, Social Worker, Success Coach, Media Specialist, SAC chair, Elective Lead, Team Leads, which all work towards achieving the culture priority of the school.