

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Burns Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Burns Middle School

615 BROOKER RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[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.

The Burns Family works together to develop responsible, high-achieving, and compassionate members of society.

*We use one statement for both the Vision and Mission.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Burns Family works together to develop responsible, high-achieving, and compassionate members of society.

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
DiPrima, Matthew	Principal	Oversee the safety, education processes and organization of the school. Attention to student and staff safety is the first priority of the principal. In addition, the strategic focus on improving student achievement is demonstrated in all actions. Clearly articulating a vision, supporting the organization as a lead learner, creating a culture of trust and using the continuous improvement model to enhance student achievement is the principal's responsibility.
Blair, Audrenita	Assistant Principal	Oversee the instructional program and build the master schedule, assign teaching units, student schedules, guidance supports and incentives. The academic program includes the Extended Learning Program, Testing, Progress Monitoring, PLC structures, Instructional Leadership Team and Systems to support students who are not meeting standards.
Mascorro, Heather	Assistant Principal	Oversee safety and security of students and staff, management of student conduct, organization and procedures of school-wide functions, academic supports and incentives for students. Aligns instructional supports to student and staff with feedback from observations and collaborative work with assigned professional learning communities. Involves stakeholder input with organizational processes and procedures while supporting the instructional and athletic program. Build student and staff culture through structures in place. Manages change and school improvement using data.
Comlish, Tracey	Math Coach	Instructor and Subject Area Leader for Math Department. Oversees math curriculum calendars and resources for math instruction. Facilitates math professional learning community amongst all grade levels within the department. Coaches teachers and provides trend data, feedback and progress monitoring of students school-wide, department-wide and teacher specific to make decisions to support student achievement. The SAL also works collaboratively with administration to provide leadership within the Instructional Leadership Team to support school-wide goals and priorities.
Justiniano-Rivera, Fabienne	Science Coach	Instructor and Subject Area Leader for the Science Department. Oversees science curriculum calendars and resources for best practices in science instruction. Facilitates science professional learning community amongst all grade levels within the department. Coaches teachers and provides trend data, feedback and progress monitoring of students school-wide, department-wide and teacher specific to make decisions to support student achievement. The SAL also works collaboratively with administration and the district to provide leadership within the Instructional Leadership Team to support district and school-wide goals and priorities.
Simon, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	Instructor and Subject Area Leader for the Literacy Department. Oversees writing and reading curriculum calendars and resources for best practices in literacy instruction. Facilitates professional learning community amongst all grade levels within the department. Coaches teachers and provides trend data, feedback and progress monitoring of students school-wide, department-wide

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and teacher specific to make decisions to support student achievement. The SAL also works collaboratively with administration and the district to provide leadership within the Instructional Leadership Team to support district and school-wide goals and priorities.
Smith, Jana	Teacher, K-12	Instructor and Subject Area Leader for the Social Studies Department. Oversees the social studies curriculum calendars and resources for best practices in social studies instruction. Facilitates professional learning community amongst all grade levels within the department. Coaches teachers and provides trend data, feedback and progress monitoring of students school-wide, department-wide and teacher specific to make decisions to support student achievement. The SAL also works collaboratively with administration and the district to provide leadership within the Instructional Leadership Team to support district and school-wide goals and priorities.
Davies-Lemal, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	The Exception Student Education Specialist oversees the alignment of supports for students with Individual Education Plans and supports students and stakeholders with expertise in the field to support teachers, students and stakeholders. Works directly with ESE teachers, paraprofessionals and administration at the school site to support student achievement for students with IEPs. Communicates to stakeholders processes and practices, collaborates with stakeholders to support student learning and goal attainment. Works with data to make decisions that are well-founded. Understands and uses district supports to provide resources to stakeholders.
Farrell, Lee	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates ongoing communication with Elective Team regarding school-wide goals and priorities. Represents elective team within the Instructional Leadership Team. Supports positive culture within student body and creates opportunities for staff to engage with elective team goals.
O'Connell, Kate	Other	PE Team Leader

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.

Burns implements weekly Professional Learning Community meetings grouped by subject area to plan and strategize monitoring students' performance. Quarterly benchmark and standards assessments are planned during the meetings and test data is discussed. Lessons are then designed and manipulated collaboratively to fill in gaps in learning. Benchmark progress monitoring occurs at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to track student achievements. This data is available relatively promptly to school staff and stakeholders so adjustments to the curriculum, classroom, and student scaffolding can be

made. Specific benchmarks may be targeted with differentiated strategies and small group instruction may be implemented.

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))

Benchmark progress monitoring occurs at the beginning, middle and end of the year. The progress monitoring data shows gaps in the state standards for learning. Adjustments to the curriculum can be made on an individual student basis and gaps in learning can be filled. Professional Learning Community meetings take place bi-weekly by subject area and data is discussed. The team may adjust the lesson plans collaboratively to ensure gains in student performance. These meetings support progress, growth, and communication of essential adjustments and needs of our students.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	110	115	316	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	75	63	226	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	17	43	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	42	62	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	99	120	318	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	43	87	196	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	51	45	131	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	77	111	236	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
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	81	107	118	306	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	52	95	221	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	29	51	103	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	60	116	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	17	35	

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	0	0	24	20	36	80

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	81	107	118	306	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	52	95	221	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	29	51	103	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	60	116	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	17	35	

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	0	0	24	20	36	80

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	80
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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*	55	49	49	59	50	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				50			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			35		
Math Achievement*	66	57	56	60	36	36	60		
Math Learning Gains				64			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			35		
Science Achievement*	53	44	49	62	52	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	66	68	81	58	58	69		
Middle School Acceleration	92	84	73	86	51	49	85		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	39	39	40	62	86	76	63		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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%
FRL	54			

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	42			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	51			
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	54			

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	55			66			53	69	92			39
SWD	17			31			10	39			4	
ELL	36			51			45	55	90		6	39
AMI												
ASN	77			83			47	85	93		5	
BLK	31			42			18	59			4	
HSP	52			62			56	56	91		6	38
MUL	56			67			50	79	91		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	59			71			60	74	91		5	
FRL	42			54			41	55	93		6	38

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	59	50	36	60	64	59	62	81	86			62
SWD	26	39	29	29	47	42	34	46	88			
ELL	43	43	38	43	58	51	41	78	53			62
AMI												
ASN	84	68		84	78		79	95	93			
BLK	42	36	16	43	57	66	50	68	81			
HSP	51	45	35	52	62	60	49	78	77			71
MUL	58	57	50	68	68	52	66	71	95			
PAC												
WHT	66	53	40	65	65	58	69	83	87			
FRL	44	45	34	47	58	55	49	72	78			55

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	62	56	35	60	53	35	50	69	85			63
SWD	27	34	26	28	35	20	19	42	79			
ELL	41	53	45	44	44	43	18	51				63
AMI												
ASN	71	69		84	69			88	85			
BLK	42	47	30	32	35	26	26	52	64			
HSP	51	49	28	50	47	34	39	60	77			71
MUL	59	46	30	58	49	38	47	70	92			
PAC												
WHT	71	62	42	69	59	38	59	78	89			
FRL	48	47	28	46	45	35	34	56	72			67

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
07	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	44%	7%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	47%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	36%	16%	48%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	41%	12%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	55%	42%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	66%	1%

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.

Literacy - The statewide Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores indicated that 6th and 7th grade students struggled with Context and Connotation, understanding the implied meaning of words as used in a text setting, and Morphology which is the study of words and their parts.

8th grade students had difficulties with Argument and Understanding Rhetoric, the art of persuasive speaking and/or writing.

Contributing factors for low performance in these areas were teacher vacancies, new curriculum, and lack of training.

Math - The statewide Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores indicated that students struggled with Geometric Reasoning across all grade levels. Students had difficulty discriminating between types of angles and formulas used to determine area of two-dimensional figures.

Contributing factors for low performance in these areas were student understanding of vocabulary and inconsistent exposure to practice with the type of questions that were going to be on the test.

Science - All components showed similar overall performance, though there was a 1-point drop in Physical and Life Science. Contributing factors: We had a vacancy until October, and the teacher taking it over was a first-year teacher. We had a teacher leave in the middle of the year and was replaced by one who had no 8th grade experience.

Social Studies - The Civics End of Course (EOC) indicated that students struggled the most in the area of Organizations and Functions of the Government. Contributing factors for low performance 2 of the 3 Civics teachers were new to teaching Civics last year and both started after the school year began. One class had a total of 3 teachers plus a long-term sub last year. Low level readers in 8th grade were tested last year, but few or no low-level readers were tested the year before.

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

In Math and Reading we cannot determine the greatest decline due to statewide assessment change. Test category breakdown dissimilar. In science Physical and Life Science showed the greatest decline. Factors contributing to the decline: The students were the remainder of a group that had covid

confinement and some took online classes. We also had 2- 8th grade positions that were not consistent throughout the year.

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.

Literacy - The data shows reading scores were above the state average in each tested category with the greatest difference above the state average in 7th grade "reading across genres and vocabulary."

Math - The data shows math scores that our combined At/Near and Above proficiency scores were above the state's combined At/Near and Above proficiency in each tested category. In 6th grade we are 2% below the state average of students being "above" in Geometric Reasoning Data and Probability". In 7th grade math We were below the state average in students being "above" proficiency with the greatest gap in "Geometric Reasoning & Probability", however, all areas were not exceeding the state average. In 8th grade math we had significantly higher results than the district average across all tested categories.

Science - We are one point above the state in all categories for the 2022 and 2023 school year. Factors the contributed: A couple of novice teachers and gaps in consistency in having a teacher in the classroom led to a reduction in scores, however we are still outperforming the state.

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

Literacy - Overall, each grade improved over the course of the year with respect to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 1 (FAST PM1) data as compared to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 3 (FAST PM3) data.

6th & 7th grades showed most improvement in the components of Central Idea.

7th & 8th grades most improved components were Theme and Comparative Reading.

Math - Each grade improved over the course of the year with respect to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 1 (FAST PM1) data as compared to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 3 (FAST PM3) data. More specifically, Algebraic Reasoning made the most improvement from PM2 to PM3.

Science - Nature of Science showed the most improvement. We incorporated Nature of Science in every activity and did extra review in that area during our weekend bootcamps. Teachers were also instructed to incorporate more lessons. Evidence from walk-through data supported the PLC work.

PE -Positives & Data- All PE coaches scores are Above the district averages in all levels 6th-8th. Actions that contributed to the success centered on reflection and revision from ongoing progress monitoring data. In addition, a focus on formative assessing students in both fitness and cognitive understanding occurred frequently and throughout every lesson.

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

Literacy - These improvements can be attributed to the application of district provided professional development in standards-based instruction and the use of Achieve3000 standards aligned articles. Literacy Professional Learning Communities, meeting and planning as a department and grade level with fidelity.

Math - These improvements can be attributed to collaboration in our professional learning communities.

After the results of the second progress monitoring, teachers created banks of questions that would allow the students to practice higher level multistep questions multiple times before taking their unit test. Teachers also identified students that scored at a level 2 and determined how to best support those students to reach proficiency.

Science - The main concern is an overall drop in content understanding. The Life, Physical and Earth Space categories need to be a greater focus this year, and incorporation into current curriculum is vital for review as this is a 3-year test.

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

Literacy - Preparing students for the statewide writing assessment. Low scores in categories like argument, context & connotation, and morphology need to be addressed to ensure our students have the tools needed to be proficient grade level readers and writers.

Math - An area of concern is the low percentage of level 4's and 5's in 6th grade compared to the district and the state.

Science - Students need to take responsibility for their learning. Goal setting and development of personalized

plans lend to accountability on the part of the student. Self-direction and student engagement is also paramount in this focus. Teachers should be facilitating and guiding, not directing the entire class period. Our PLC work was evident with clear focus, teachers can improve student performance. Using progress monitoring data teachers will continue to revise focus based on the needs of the students.

Social Studies - Civics-building knowledge of the teachers for the new Civics standards & new TCI textbooks that are supposed to be arriving this fall. More targeted interventions for students in a timely manner.

PE - Strategies & Progress/Actions

Track running times for mile and laps for PACER

Fitnessgram

Electronic exams

PD-

Ideas for small sided games w/ large classroom sizes

Higher level of questioning

Continued Actions-

Pre and post assessment

Continue to role out content, showing connections for students to live happier & healthier lives

Electives - Continue to build content vocabulary knowledge within each elective.

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 ELA**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.

For the Literacy department to help our students make gains and achieve success we want to focus on the Gradual Release of Responsibility strategy. "I Do, We Do, You Do" is the building block and leads to all the other strategies presented to us in our meeting. Because our department has a mixture of teaching experience levels, we feel that taking a step back and focusing on this strategy will help us to remember that "Teacher Directed Explicit Instruction" is what drives us forward and is best practice. We also want to include the development of language with our students. We want to teach students to improve in their vocabulary and use of language in supporting their learning. We want to have students practice writing to support their argument, understanding and explanation of ideas from context.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable outcomes should be seen in progress monitoring data collected from the baseline writes assessment, Language Live data assessments and district progress monitoring reports.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through learning walks, demonstration classrooms and ongoing feedback using "look fors" created by the faculty and galvanized by our Instructional Leadership Team. Trend data collected through observations will be shared with faculty members to improve instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew DiPrima (matthew.diprima@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.)

Gradual release model will be used to enhance modeling skill development with reluctant readers and writers. Also, building student agency through vocabulary skill building with ongoing feedback using higher order thinking questions and differentiated grouping strategies to enhance student discussion will be used as a tool for teachers to engage students and monitor progress/provide feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies is designed to provide engaging opportunities for students to differentiate their learning us support and monitoring by the teacher. Increasing student vocabulary will enhance literacy skills.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Create standards based HOT questions to challenge student thinking. Then, provide strategies for students to communicate with one another use context vocabulary.

Person Responsible: Dawn Simon (dawn.simon@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the year and with a clear understanding of reflect and revise as progress monitoring data for current student population is analyzed. The time for reflection will begin during the first quarter PLCs.

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

Math teachers will integrate more problems into their instruction that align with grade appropriate standards where we performed low compared to the district. We will continue creating banks of higher-level multi-step questions to be used with each unit. We will integrate content specific vocabulary to daily instruction and hold students accountable for using correct math terms.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will use progress monitoring data to demonstrate progress in meeting desired outcomes. Walk-through data will be used to demonstrate consistency and similarities with anticipated vocabulary struggles and classroom reinforcement by the teacher. Students will demonstrate mastery with use in answering questions during discussion and explanations to others in support of their learning.

Monitoring:

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

Walk thru data will be collected and shared for PLCs. PM data collection will also be analyzed and dissected by teachers..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew DiPrima (matthew.diprima@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.)

Creating HOT question banks and using strategies to group students for opportunities to discuss where the teacher monitors progress circulating and providing feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student discussion groups where they use reciprocal teaching techniques is an evidence-based strategy teachers will use to have students explain.

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.

Planning HOT questions in PLC groups

Person Responsible: Tracey Comlish (tracey.comlish@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing in PLCs and when analyzing PM data reflecting and revising, as needed. A first quarter focus will take place in August and September and adjustments will be made, if needed.

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

Collaborate in PLCs to analyze data to plan engaging lessons that are on-grade level and differentiated.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student achievement in content area based on progress monitoring data.

Monitoring:

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

The SAL with assistance from grade-level PLC facilitators and support from an assigned administrator will support teacher PLC groups to analyze data, plan accordingly to differentiate instruction and review progress monitoring data. PM data will consist of student performance assessments, formative assessments, and walk-thru data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Audrenita Blair (114379@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.)

Using grade-level and above standards based HOT questions similar to those seen on formal assessments to have students practice with scaffolds in learning vocabulary content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students are posed to answer HOT questions and reply using learned content vocabulary they should subsequently be adept to seeing it on formalized tests.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

PLCs meet and analyze data, reflect and revise ongoing strategies to target differentiated student needs.

Person Responsible: Audrenita Blair (114379@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing, but specifically between progress monitoring testing sessions.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Higher order thinking questions will be designed to challenge students and check for understanding of grade level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If students practice persistence with learning content area vocabulary and answering challenging standards-based questions, then, they will succeed in demonstrating proficiency with content area standards.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data demonstrating student learning gains from one progress monitoring to another. Walk-thru data will be used to demonstrate frequency and depth of knowledge of students and question types.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew DiPrima (matthew.diprima@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.)

Student discussion groups with teacher feedback. This could be small-group instruction or other types of differentiated grouping strategies to target specific student needs with content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is based on the fact that real-time progress monitoring occurs throughout the lesson and the students will need opportunities to demonstrate their understanding in various ways.

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.

SAL oversight with PLC work. Data trends shared from walk-thru data. Ongoing adjustments as new data is analyzed.

Person Responsible: Audrenita Blair (114379@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the first progress monitoring data.

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Student agency will be developed by building a PROUD school community. The acts of Perseverance, Respect, Ownership, Unity and Diversity will be highlighted and recognized.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Outcomes will improve in our student climate data. Referrals for top tier incidences will decrease.

Monitoring:

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

Positive Behavior Supports Committee and Discipline committee will meet regularly and reviewing ongoing student climate data and discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Mascorro (heather.mascorro@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.)

PBIS - Star-bucs will be used to highlight and incentivize positive behaviors with a menu of options for using Star-bucs. Student clubs to support school community and build more student-adult relationships to support school culture will be established.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive school culture creates a safe environment for students to excel academically.

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.

School Clubs with student selected club.

Person Responsible: Heather Mascorro (heather.mascorro@hcps.net)

By When: By September 30.

Committees meeting regularly that support school culture - Discipline, PBIS, Safety, etc.

Person Responsible: Matthew DiPrima (matthew.diprima@hcps.net)

By When: By September 30.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes