Okaloosa County School District

Max Bruner Junior Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Max Bruner Junior Middle School

322 HOLMES BLVD NW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Heather Graham Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 4/23/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Okaloosa 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.](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

Max Bruner Junior Middle School

322 HOLMES BLVD NW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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.

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bruner Middle School strives to provide all Spartans with a safe and rigorous learning environment to grow both academically and socially

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
Massey, Gary	Principal	
Colmon, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction/ELA
Tryon, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Pummer, Dee	Teacher, K-12	
Jackson, Alec	Teacher, K-12	
Jackson, Angelica	Teacher, K-12	
LaBorde, Scott	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 4/23/2019, Heather Graham Williams

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.*
2

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
788

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.
12

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	292	257	234	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	42	46	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	35	27	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	14	3	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	3	5	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	78	0	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	71	62	0	0	0	0	223
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	78	0	0	0	0	219

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	87	82	85	0	0	0	0	254

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	13	1	3	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/26/2022

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	305	249	253	0	0	0	0	807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	0	0	29	26	32	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	20	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	46	51	0	0	0	0	166
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	25	12	10	0	0	0	0	47

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	27	15	8	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	305	249	253	0	0	0	0	807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	0	0	29	26	32	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	20	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	46	51	0	0	0	0	166
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	25	12	10	0	0	0	0	47

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	27	15	8	0	0	0	0	50
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	55%	50%				56%	67%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						56%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						50%	56%	47%
Math Achievement	49%	36%	36%				59%	75%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						51%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						43%	63%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	63%	53%				63%	71%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	66%	58%				67%	81%	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	2022					
	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	66%	-8%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	31%	62%	-31%	55%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	59%	73%	-14%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	65%	-11%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	48%	12%
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	66%	77%	-11%	71%	-5%
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	85%	77%	8%	61%	24%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	73%	-73%	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	28	37	23	31	54	60	45	37	39		
ELL	30	37	30	28	45	42	30	44	60		
ASN	42	40		50	64						
BLK	31	43	28	34	60	67	36	40	57		
HSP	35	41	33	40	52	53	47	58	55		
MUL	51	53	33	59	59	53	52	85	70		
WHT	51	44	28	58	62	58	59	62	55		
FRL	38	44	31	42	55	55	50	53	49		
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	28	38	31	29	30	29	36	47	38		
ELL	25	49	54	36	28	24	36	42			

				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
ASN	60	71		59	13						
BLK	28	32	29	22	17	20	35	50	41		
HSP	46	49	38	40	27	36	49	65	32		
MUL	50	42	17	45	33	40	59	65	38		
WHT	54	48	40	52	33	36	73	65	74		
FRL	42	42	36	37	25	31	56	58	42		
				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	34	45	47	35	40	30	46	42	57		
ELL	33	35	10	54	35	50	43	50			
ASN	50	50		86	64						
BLK	47	54	54	43	50	45	57	57	63		
HSP	47	43	27	54	39	38	65	72	53		
MUL	59	51	46	58	47	48	77	58	69		
WHT	61	60	55	66	56	41	61	75	68		
FRL	53	54	48	53	50	44	59	64	61		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

ESSA subgroups and both ELA and Math were below 50% proficiency

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

Our data components show our greatest need is to improve literacy across content areas which will increase overall student performance.

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

As we are still transitioning out of COVID and students getting re-acclimated to structure, some instructional time,
was lost, which is a major contributing factor to low proficiency in both ELA and Math.

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

Base off of our data components, Science and Social Studies performed 50% or higher in proficiency on state assessments.

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

Teachers were all veterans and highly effective. Teachers also collaborated during common planning to create rigorous lessons and assessments.

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

Teachers will utilize data-driven academic growth strategies, such as; citing evidence, making inferences and collaborate techniques to emphasize Interactive Whole Group instruction and cooperative learning opportunities centered around comprehension and analysis of appropriately complex text(s)

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.

Instructional coach will provide professional development in support of teachers in data analysis and to create interactive lessons addressing BEST Benchmarks.

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

N/A

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Scores below proficiency on FSA ELA and/or Math Scores below proficiency on WIDA Access for ELLs
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	40% of our English Language Learners will score 50% proficiency on state assessment. 60% will make typical growth by 3rd i-Ready diagnostic.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	ESOL strategies (mentor sentences, visual supports for academic vocabulary development) will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs. I-ready diagnostic will be used to monitor ELA and proficiency and learning gains
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline Colmon (colmonj@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implement the gradual release model within interactive whole group instruction. I do (teacher modeling), We do (teacher-guided and student interactive whole group instruction), You do it together (student collaboration with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it alone (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows that students learn best in an interactive whole group setting. This setting allows students to cooperatively learn which builds confidence for independent learning. Interactive Whole Group Instruction requires purposeful student engagement which will improve overall student 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.

Utilizing supplemental curriculum including adaptable flashcards and materials through Continental Press Newcomer Kits, online student accounts to support language acquisition and content area vocabulary - DuoLingo, and Edmentum ELL Foundations – for ELLs at beginning level English proficiency;

Instructional teams will review Ellevation strategies and goals based on the individual student's level of English proficiency to inform instruction and intervention.

Developmental Language Arts teacher(s) will utilize WIDA practice activities for language development in speaking, reading, writing, and listening development.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Colmon (colmonj@okaloosaschools.com)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]

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

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Scores below proficiency on FSA ELA and/or Math
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	40 % of ES students will score 50 % or above proficiency on state assessments. 65% of ESE students will make Typical Growth by the 3rd i-Ready diagnostic.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use Unit assessments and i-Ready diagnostics as our progress monitoring tools.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline Colmon (colmonj@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implement the gradual release model within interactive whole group instruction. I do (teacher modeling), We do (teacher-guided and student interactive whole group instruction), You do it together (student collaboration with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it alone (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows students learn best in an interactive whole group setting. This setting allows students to cooperatively learn which builds confidence for independent learning. Interactive Whole Group Instruction requires purposeful student engagement which will improve overall student 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.

Interactive Whole Group Instruction:

Using the "I do, we do, you do together, you do" gradual release to explicitly model skill/ strategy / fluency leading to eventual independent practice.

Provide one-on-one assistance with completing assignments for general education teachers.

Provide alternate setting for SWDs to complete assessments (and/or use of extended time) for general education teachers

Post student-centered learning objectives along with success criteria for each lesson to guide instruction.

Model skill & norms for student expectations.

Provide frequent and authentic feedback to students for self-monitoring.

Provide technology to enhance instruction & work completion

Utilize Chromebook to provide greater mobility in the classroom. Access various platforms needed to complete assignments for general education teachers.

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Colmon (colmonj@okaloosaschools.com)

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.

Bruner's administrative team are servant leaders. They genuinely care for the needs of their staff, students, and parents. They have an open-door policy to discuss concerns and also enjoy collaboratively making decisions. They celebrate faculty achievements during faculty meetings with Bruner's Spartan Award recognition. Weekly emails from the principal keep faculty abreast of changes. These weekly emails are also used to share insight from faculty, make special announcements, and share accomplishments. Announcements over the intercom are made daily to inform students of daily news and also to celebrate student accomplishments.
Bruner has implemented a PBIS along with school-wide expectations which focus on building positive values.
This system is a proactive approach to discipline and will help increase attendance while decreasing learning loss.
Our plan is to have school pep rallies that highlight sports and academic teams. This is a fun, engaging way to
build school morale. Students also enjoy Spirit week which is held during October. These
events are teambuilding opportunities that expose students to a variety of fun nonacademic-focused activities.
We have made several changes to improve the physical environment of the school by cleaning up and removing the old equipment, pressure washing, purchased new signs, painted parking lot lines, installed a new wrought-iron fence, newly updated entrance, and larger upgraded lockers for students.
The administrative team is visible throughout the school day starting with the administrators welcoming students each morning as they arrive. Each administrator is assigned a daily lunch cafeteria duty and a hall during every transition period. Being visible allows us to keep abreast of what's going on in the school, the needs, what needs to be improved, and to understand the atmosphere that permeates the hallways and classrooms.

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

The administrative team is visible throughout the school, making sure students and staff are safe. The administrative team makes an effort to connect with all students, teachers, and staff which builds strong relationships.

Our PBIS team has put in place incentives for both students and teachers to recognize success and positive behavior. Teachers use incentives within their classrooms to recognize positive behavior. Guidance Counselors meet with students to discuss academic concerns as well social-emotional issues. We have itinerants who meet with students on a weekly basis to help with any struggles students are experiencing. Mentors and parents are taking part in promoting a positive culture. Our mentors meet with parents and students to help bridge academic and emotional gaps. Parents volunteer for SAC and extra-curricula activities.