Burney Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Burney Elementary School

901 S EVERS ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Quinlan, Brooke	Principal	Supervise instruction and monitor effectiveness of SIP.
Braglin, Megan	Assistant Principal	Supervise instruction and monitor effectiveness of SIP.
Drake, Sara	Reading Coach	Coach teachers, support planning, monitor effectiveness of SIP.
Sandoval, Maribel	Math Coach	Coach teachers, support planning, monitor effectiveness of SIP.
Zamora, Lilia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coach teachers, support planning, monitor effectiveness of SIP.
McLean, Stephanie	Attendance/Social Work	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

A SIP group met in June to discuss survey results, barriers and goals to create the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be monitored quarterly with our ILT, Academic Leadership Team, Student Services Leadership Team. We will review look-for data as well as student achievement data including subgroups.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	19	20	16	21	17	14	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	4	1	2	7	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	30	26	13	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	27	28	23	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	26	13	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	28	23	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	2	3	16	11	0	0	0	36

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	17	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	17	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	10	10	10	7	0	0	0	46

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	17	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	17	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	10	10	10	7	0	0	0	46

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	50	53	31	53	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				50			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			40		
Math Achievement*	29	56	59	40	50	50	23		
Math Learning Gains				67			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			43		
Science Achievement*	30	50	54	29	59	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	51	59	59	45			37		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	162
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	26	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	3	1
HSP	33	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	35	Yes	1	
FRL	31	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	29			29			30					51
SWD	19			19			20				5	30
ELL	17			33			23				5	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			14			29				3	
HSP	30			33			29				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37			37							3	
FRL	27			28			27				5	52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	31	50	36	40	67	59	29					45
SWD	11	32	22	26	65	62	17					40
ELL	29	56	30	40	61	50	27					45
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	21	39	36	27	61	64	18					
HSP	32	52	25	44	68	58	29					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46	59		50	76		45					
FRL	30	49	36	39	69	62	30					45

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	31	45	40	23	27	43	21					37
SWD	10	38		12	30		0					29
ELL	29	52		25	24		25					37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	35		12	26		17					
HSP	35	52		28	28		21					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43			29								
FRL	29	40	40	22	27	43	14					37

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	58%	-25%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	20%	46%	-26%	50%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	55%	-29%	59%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	59%	-26%	61%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	51%	-21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest performance for the 22-23 school year was ELA proficiency. Our 3rd-5th grade students were at 30% proficiency according to the PM3 FAST Assessment. This percentage of proficiency is a trend for Burney Elementary and consistent with previous years.

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

Math saw the greatest decline with a 6% drop in proficiency from 40 to 34% proficient according to the 2023-2024 PM3 Fast Data.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The highest discrepancies between state data and school data was 3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiency.

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

Science maintained proficiency for the 22-23 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Literacy proficiency is of the highest concern for Burney Elementary School.

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

Increasing Student Attendance
Increasing Literacy Proficiency
Increasing Math Proficiency

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ELA and Math proficiency rates at Burney are significantly lower than that state at just 30 and 34 percent respectively.
ELA Proficiency
1st Grade: ALL: 25%; SWD: 0%, ELL 18%; Black 18%
2nd Grade: ALL 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 36%
3rd Grade: ALL: 23%; SWD 33%; ELL 5%; Black 10%
4th Grade: ALL: 31%; SWD 18%; ELL 20%; Black 29%
5th Grade: ALL:36%; SWD 0%; ELL 22%; Black 29%

Math Proficiency:
K ALL: 21%; SWD 0%; ELL 0%; Black 14%
1 ALL: 34%; SWD 22%; ELL 29%; Black: 18%
2 ALL: 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 31%
3 ALL: 26%; SWD 11%; ELL 32%; Black 10%
4 ALL: 31%; SWD 24%; ELL 25%; Black 12%
5 ALL: 33%; SWD 10%; ELL 35%; Black 18%

Given the low proficiency rates across both intermediate and primary in both ELA and Mathematics focusing on aligning benchmarks will help increase proficiency across all subgroups and grade levels.

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

Each grade level will increase their proficiency by 15% in both math and reading according to the FAST and STAR PM 3 assessments.
By the end of Q1 50% of teachers will be utilizing the checks for understanding system in their classrooms.
By the end of Q2 75% of teachers will be utilizing the checks for understanding system in their classrooms.

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

PM1, PM2 and iReady Data will be utilized to determine if progress is being made towards our academic goals. The expectation is that 8% growth in proficiency will occur by PM 2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Burney Elementary School will create common checks for understanding and questions for discourse during collaborative planning to include exemplars and a plan for providing feedback to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By creating exemplars, Burney teachers will have a deeper understanding of the rigor of the benchmarks and the instruction required to reach mastery of the benchmarks and provide feedback to students. According to Hattie's analysis teacher clarity has an effective size of .75 and feedback has an effect size of .70.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Collaborative weekly planning will occur for each grade level. During this planning teachers will select and plan for tasks, write exemplar responses, identify misconceptions, and determine how best to capture data of student performance through checks for understanding. The will also craft questions for student discourse.

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

By When: September 2023

Teachers will visit Model classrooms with ILT team to watch teachers who utilize daily checklists to monitor checks for understanding and provide feedback effectively.

Person Responsible: Megan Braglin (megan.braglin@hcps.net)

By When: December 2023

Academic Leadership Team will provide training on feedback after data collection and exemplar use is at a fidelity rate of 75%.

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

By When: March 2023

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ELA and Math proficiency rates at Burney are significantly lower than that state at just 30 and 34 percent respectively.
ELA Proficiency
1st Grade: ALL: 25%; SWD: 0%, ELL 18%; Black 18%
2nd Grade: ALL 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 36%
3rd Grade: ALL: 23%; SWD 33%; ELL 5%; Black 10%
4th Grade: ALL: 31%; SWD 18%; ELL 20%; Black 29%
5th Grade: ALL:36%; SWD 0%; ELL 22%; Black 29%

Math Proficiency:
K ALL: 21%; SWD 0%; ELL 0%; Black 14%
1 ALL: 34%; SWD 22%; ELL 29%; Black: 18%
2 ALL: 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 31%
3 ALL: 26%; SWD 11%; ELL 32%; Black 10%
4 ALL: 31%; SWD 24%; ELL 25%; Black 12%
5 ALL: 33%; SWD 10%; ELL 35%; Black 18%

Given the low proficiency rates across both intermediate and primary in both ELA and Mathematics focusing on aligning benchmarks will help increase proficiency across all subgroups and grade levels.

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

Increase proficiency of students with disabilities by 5%.

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

Proficiency will be monitored on FAST and UNIT assessments for reading and FAST and Quarterly assessments for Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Burney Elementary School will hold weekly PLCs to review data of students with SWD and plan direct instruction strategies that will be utilized in daily instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWD students require different planning than general education students and according to Hattie's research direct instruction has an effect size of .60.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ELA and Math proficiency rates at Burney are significantly lower than that state at just 30 and 34 percent respectively.
ELA Proficiency
1st Grade: ALL: 25%; SWD: 0%, ELL 18%; Black 18%
2nd Grade: ALL 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 36%
3rd Grade: ALL: 23%; SWD 33%; ELL 5%; Black 10%
4th Grade: ALL: 31%; SWD 18%; ELL 20%; Black 29%
5th Grade: ALL:36%; SWD 0%; ELL 22%; Black 29%

Math Proficiency:
K ALL: 21%; SWD 0%; ELL 0%; Black 14%
1 ALL: 34%; SWD 22%; ELL 29%; Black: 18%
2 ALL: 26%; SWD 17%; ELL 25%; Black 31%
3 ALL: 26%; SWD 11%; ELL 32%; Black 10%
4 ALL: 31%; SWD 24%; ELL 25%; Black 12%
5 ALL: 33%; SWD 10%; ELL 35%; Black 18%

Given the low proficiency rates across both intermediate and primary in both ELA and Mathematics focusing on aligning benchmarks will help increase proficiency across all subgroups and grade levels.

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

The number of proficient black students will increase by 5% according to PM2 and 10% according to PM3.

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

Proficiency will be monitored on FAST and UNIT assessments for reading and FAST and Quarterly assessments for Math (cut scores will be determined in October after state board meeting)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Megan Braglin (megan.braglin@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Burney Elementary School will invite all black students to small group tutoring sessions starting in September.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Foundational skills and previous skills, while spiraled, are not specifically taught in core instruction. According to Hattie, small group instruction has an effect size of .54.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

32% of Burney Elementary School's students miss more than 90% of the school year.

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

Decrease the number of students missing more than 90% of the school year by 10%.

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

Each month the attendance percentage for students who missed more than 10% of the school year will be reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie McLean (stephanie.mclean@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Weekly attendance check-in with students and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In Gottfried's 2019 study (Chronic absenteeism in the classroom context: Effects on achievement), "...students
who are chronically absent have lower achievement outcomes." (p. 25) "Students in classrooms with a higher
percentage of chronic absentees have lower test scores." (p. 26)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Social Worker and Community Resource Office will identify all students with an attendance rate of less than 90% in 22-23.

Person Responsible: Stephanie McLean (stephanie.mclean@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023.

Social Worker and Parent Liasion will reach out to families and identify barriers.

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

By When: September 2023

Social Worker will create attendance calendars for all students with chronically low attendance (below 90%) and complete weekly check-ins to ensure that attendance is improving.

Person Responsible: Stephanie McLean (stephanie.mclean@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023

Quarterly celebrations will occur with both parents and students for those with improved attendance and perfect attendance.

Person Responsible: Stephanie McLean (stephanie.mclean@hcps.net)

By When: October 2023, December 2023, March 2023, May 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Burney Elementary School reviews the Title I budget with the School Advisory Council in the Spring of 2023. During this meeting, it is determined what personnel and resources are required to improve academic and social metrics.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers will implement an extended foundational skills block utilizing UFLI materials created by the University of Florida. 65% of Kindergarten students are below the 40th%tile. 72% of grade 1 students are below the 40th %tile. 70% of grade 2 students are below the 40th %tile.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Teachers will provide targeted foundational skills support to students receiving a Level 1 on the FAST assessment. 70% of students in Grades 3-5 score below a level 3 on the FAST 2023 Statewide Assessment.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students above the 50% on the STAR assessment will increase 20% over 22-23 results.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students scoring above a level 1 on the Spring administration of FAST will increase by 10%.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Classroom walkthroughs will indicate that the foundational skills block and small group instruction occurs with fidelity 80% of the time.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Drake, Sara, sara.drake@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

K-2 teachers will utilize the UFLI Toolbox along with the suggested scope and sequence to implement a whole group foundational skills block.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

As of last year, 60% of grades k-3 students were below level in Phonics according to the spring administration of iReady.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership
- ◦ Literacy Coaching
- ◦ Assessment
- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide planning to teachers on components of UFLI and how it will be used in whole group (k-2) and small group (3-5) instruction.	Drake, Sara, sara.drake@hcps.net
Provide instructional coaching on best practices of UFLI weekly to all K-2 teachers.	Drake, Sara, sara.drake@hcps.net
Utilize UFLI walkthrough form to provide feedback and document fidelity.	Drake, Sara, sara.drake@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Once approved, a SIP overview document will be shared with parents. Three times per year, in conjunction with data night parents will receive an update to the goals of the SIP as part of their conference night experience.
It will also be placed on our school webpage. https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/burney

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/burney
We will continue to leverage our community partners to achieve or academic and attendance goals. We plan to hold make and takes during our parent data nights with materials that will assist families with supporting their children at home. In addition to our data nights, we have a minimum of 1 additional family experience per month to help build relationships.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school plans to strengthen the academic program by collaboratively planning for checks for understanding and building a deeper understanding of what student products are acceptable evidence of mastery of students. In addition, by expanding on the time spent on foundational skills in the literacy block, Burney will build stronger leaders. This increase in literacy will positively impact all subject areas.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Currently, Burney houses two HeadStart units. Those HeadStart teachers will also increase the time spent on literacy foundational skills and will begin to incorporate UFLI materials to bridge the gap between pre-k and kindergarten.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

As part of our weekly specials rotation, Burney Elementary provides character education to all students utilizing 7 mindsets and second step materials. In addition, all teachers use the 7 mindsets curriculum to support character education in their classes.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school uses PBIS as it's Tier 1 model for behavior. We use 7 mindsets as our curriculum for instruction on character education. We review Tier 1 behavior data weekly and assign students to students to early intervention services such as mental health counseling, additional social skills training and potential tier 2 and tier 3 services. In addition, character education is built into our specials rotation. We utilize the second step curriculum.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Each teacher at Burney Elementary School is provided in-class professional learning through 5 and 10 day coaching cycles. During those cycles results from academic assessment as well as results of classroom walkthroughs are used to drive the professional learning for each teacher.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The school invites parents from Headstart programs to all school events including data nights. In addition, tours and presentations are held in the spring to aide in the transition.