

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Burnett Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Burnett Middle School

1010 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Valerie Newton**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/29/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

## **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

Burnett Middle School will utilize data-driven decision making in order to implement research based instructional strategies that foster a safe climate & culture and provide the opportunity for students to achieve curriculum mastery.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

Burnett Middle School will create an atmosphere that produces citizens who are present, accountable, work together and show respect, while preparing for college and/or career success.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newton, Valerie	Principal	Progress monitoring of the school's comprehensive improvement plan.
Brooks, Tarrelle	Assistant Principal	Progress Monitoring of PBIS and School Culture Improvement Initiatives
Schlarbaum, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Progress Monitoring of Instruction and Curriculum
	SAC Member	SAC Chair

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 1/29/2019, Valerie Newton

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

11

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

11

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

50

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	247	253	201	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	38	52	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	65	86	0	0	0	0	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	41	32	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	41	32	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	96	124	0	0	0	0	345
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	96	124	0	0	0	0	345

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	41	82	0	0	0	0	187

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

Monday 6/29/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	288	203	268	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	77	82	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	92	84	0	0	0	0	251
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	102	82	0	0	0	0	246
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	128	116	0	0	0	0	340

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	120	108	0	0	0	0	320

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	288	203	268	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	77	82	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	92	84	0	0	0	0	251
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	102	82	0	0	0	0	246
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	128	116	0	0	0	0	340

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	120	108	0	0	0	0	320

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%	51%	54%	37%	52%	53%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	41%	52%	54%	46%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	47%	47%	41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	33%	55%	58%	34%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	41%	57%	57%	44%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	52%	51%	35%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	47%	51%	35%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	67%	72%	55%	66%	72%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	54%	-18%	52%	-16%
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	36%	53%	-17%	56%	-20%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	58%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
	2018	23%	48%	-25%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	37%	62%	-25%	54%	-17%
	2018	37%	61%	-24%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	10%	31%	-21%	46%	-36%
	2018	7%	29%	-22%	45%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%
2018	52%	65%	-13%	71%	-19%
Compare		0%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	63%	63%	0%	61%	2%
2018	93%	63%	30%	62%	31%
Compare		-30%			

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	29	32	14	32	33	12	27			
ELL	14	33	35	12	25	27	7	35			
ASN				30							
BLK	28	32	32	20	34	33	14	52	47		
HSP	37	46	38	37	43	30	26	52	75		
MUL	56	69		50	37		42				
WHT	39	38	26	39	45	50	40	60	57		
FRL	34	40	35	31	40	36	25	54	58		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	33	29	9	28	29	15	23			
ELL	9	41	50	18	38	33	27	29			
ASN	42	58		67	58						
BLK	27	44	40	23	38	30	22	46	69		
HSP	38	47	43	34	47	38	38	50	89		
MUL	55	43		41	62			54			
WHT	40	45	38	39	43	32	38	66	75		
FRL	35	45	40	31	42	35	32	53	84		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	30
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component showed the lowest performance overall was 8th Grade Math, with 10% of Burnett Middle School students scored a 3 or above. The primary contributing factor was identified as a lack of intensive math courses and support for level one and level two students.

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

Algebra I EOC scores decreased from 93% to 63% proficiency rates. This decline can be attributed to changes in scheduling standards that placed students of lower math and reading proficiency into Algebra I that would not have received this placement based on 2017-2018 scheduling standards. Students were all scheduled into Algebra Honors class, and master scheduling did not utilize the Algebra track that previously provided the research support course. In addition, the Algebra I instructor previously taught seventh grade math and did not have experience in the Algebra I curriculum. Students were offered tutoring before/after school and during lunch, however the majority of students chose not to utilize this additional support. Another contributing factor related to this decline in proficiency can be attributed to decreased student attendance rates.

#### 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 data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 8th Grade Math, with a current proficiency level that is 36% below state average. The

primary contributing factor was identified as a lack of intensive math courses and support for level one and level two students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 6th Grade Math, as evidenced by an 8% increase from 2018 to 2019. This increase can be attributed to increased teacher attendance and motivation to meet the needs of the students.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Based on 2018-2019 EWS data, three potential areas of concern include the following:  
8th grade math proficiency is currently at 10%, which is 36% below the state average  
Algebra proficiency decreased 30% from 2018 to 2019  
Science Achievement Decreased 7% from 2018 to 2019

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

1. In order to address academic deficiencies evidenced by 8th grade math proficiency of 10%, Burnett Middle School will employ content area specialists in order to enhance academic performance and school culture through instructional coaching and student interventions based on attendance, behavior, and curriculum indicators. These specialists include the following: Math Coach, Reading Coach, Science SAL, Language Arts SAL, Social Studies SAL and Student Success Coach.
2. Burnett Middle School will enhance the student and faculty culture and climate through the implementation of PBIS systems, restorative practices, and social emotional learning. PBIS protocols will be designed in a manner that reinforces student attendance, behavior, and curriculum.
3. Burnett Middle School instruction will focus on the educational philosophy of content mastery, allowing for the instructional autonomy necessary to individualize and differentiate instruction based on student assessment data.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Math saw the most significant drop in performance out of all areas, specifically Algebra.

**Measureable Outcome:** 90% proficiency on the Algebra EOC.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Progress monitoring includes a year long action plan with monthly targets and remediation as needed.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** This strategy will allow us to plan, monitor the plans progress, adapt monthly based on data and address individual students not meeting learning targets identified each month via ELP and tutorials.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Yearly Department Action Plan w/ Math Coach, Angelique Diaz.

**Person Responsible** Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Monthly Action Plan w/ Math Coach, Angelique Diaz

**Person Responsible** Valerie Newton (valerie.newton@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Instructional Priority #1: Burnett Middle School will increase course performance by using assessment data to plan and implement standard based instruction that supports student learning through unpacking standards, creating learning targets, using resources and reflecting on teaching practices.**

**Instructional Priority #2: Burnett Middle School will increase course performance by planning and utilizing a variety of rigorous student engagement strategies.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Burnett Middle School will adhere to the school-wide PBIS/CHAMPS model in order to decrease overall discipline & create an ongoing student-centered positive environment that will lead to positive relationships, cultural sensitivity and high expectations for all.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>