Hillsborough County Public Schools

BURNS MIDDLE SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

A. School Mission and Vision 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2

C. Demographic Data 11

D. Early Warning Systems 12

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 15

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 16

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 17

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 18

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 19

E. Grade Level Data Review 22

III. Planning for Improvement 23

IV. Positive Learning Environment 30

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 33

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 36

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 37

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The Burns family will work together to develop responsible, high achieving and compassionate members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement

The Burns family will work together to develop responsible, high achieving and compassionate members of society.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Matthew DiPrima

matthew.diprima@hcps.net

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee school organization and daily structures and systems to support students and staff.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Audrenita Blair

audrenita.blair@hcps.net

Position Title
Assistant Principal for Curriculum

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Master Schedule - Instructional Leadership, Testing, Discipline and Culture.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Jason Dorray

jason.dorray@hcps.net

Position Title
Assistant Principal for Student Affairs

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Instructional leadership, discipline, administrative oversight of student activities: athletics, clubs, field trips, building maintenance.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Lindsay Zielinski

lindsay.zielinski@hcps.net

Position Title
SAC Chair - 6th Grade Team Leader - Reading Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides leadership of School Advisory Committee; community engagement; school improvement using the continuous improvement model; student achievement focus; Team and culture builder

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Tracey Comlish

tracey.comlish@hcps.net

Position Title
Math Subject Area Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee and support Math teachers, curriculum, student progress monitoring and department goals/

strategies for improvement. Works with district to support district curriculum, instructional strategies and feedback.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name
Fabienne Justiniano

fabienne.justiniano@hcps.net

Position Title
Science Subject Area Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee Science department and support students and staff with improving and meeting performance goals. Facilitate with grade level PLCs in conjunction with district supports to provide ongoing progress monitoring to differentiate supports for staff and students.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name
Kate Pattinson

Katharine.pattinson@hcps.net

Position Title
Literacy Subject Area Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee Language Art and Reading PLC. Support staff and students to meet state standards using district provided curriculum. Using progress monitoring assessments to follow the continuous improvement model to ascertain and provide differentiated learning strategies for improved student achievement in reading, writing and language arts.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name
Jana Smith

jana.smith@hcps.net

Position Title
Social Studies Subject Area Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee progress and lead PLC to facilitate growth for students in all social studies courses.

Specifically, create plans for PLCs to demonstrate progress monitoring, feedback and improvement in all students in meeting the benchmarks using district provided curriculum.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name
Roberto Rosa

roberto.rosa@hcps.net

Position Title
Physical Education Teacher/ Classroom Teachers Association School Representative

Job Duties and Responsibilities

PE instructor: implements district/state PE curriculum, motivates and encourages teamwork, cardiovascular fitness and overall health. Serves as CTA union school representative and acts as a liaison between faculty and administration on school improvement practices.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Position Title

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name
Laura Schilling

laura.schilling@hcps.net

Position Title
Family and Consumer Science Teacher; Elective SAC Representative

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide ongoing support for school improvement and description of elective team strategies to support SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name
Akisha Dawson Garcia

akisha.dawson-garcia@hcps.net

Position Title
Reading Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports school improvement as representative of the reading department. Communicates about reading curriculum and goals/strategies to improve reading achievement levels using the continuous improvement model.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name
Maria Perez

maria.perez1@hcps.net

Position Title
School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support students and staff to increase student achievement from the student services team perspective.

Leadership Team Member #14

Employee's Name
kathy Squires

kathleen.squires@hcps.net

Position Title
Clerical - Main office secretary

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide School Improvement recommendations from the perspective of Instructional Support at Burns. Also, communicates SIP goals and school calendar events. Provides ongoing community engagement and support for overall school culture.

Leadership Team Member #15

Employee's Name
Diane Page

diane.page@hcps.net

Position Title
ESE Behavior Resource Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides SIP support and communicates progress of Exceptional Student Education department goals and strategies.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Burns Middle School SIP Stakeholder Engagement and Continuous Improvement Process

Overview: Burns Middle School follows a **Continuous Improvement Model** to ensure that all students achieve academic success in a safe, supportive, and engaging environment. The SIP process is grounded in the **Marzano High Reliability Schools (HRS) framework** and **The Art and Science of Teaching**, ensuring a research-based, data-driven approach to school improvement.

Stakeholder Involvement Process

1. Formation of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT): The ILT includes administrators, Subject Area Leaders and teacher leaders. This team leads the SIP process and ensures alignment with district goals and HRS indicators.

2. Data Review and Needs Assessment: All stakeholders—including teachers, staff, parents, students, and community/business partners—are engaged in reviewing:

- Student achievement data (formative, summative, and benchmark assessments)
- Perception data (surveys from staff, students, and families)
- Behavior and attendance trends
- Instructional practices and professional development needs

3. School Advisory Council (SAC): The SAC, which includes all required stakeholder groups, meets to:

- Review data and school performance
- Provide input on goals and strategies
- Monitor progress and implementation

4. Planning and Action Steps: Using the HRS framework, the ILT and SAC collaboratively:

- Identify priority areas (e.g., safe and collaborative culture, effective instruction)
- Develop SMART goals and aligned action steps
- Use **The Art and Science of Teaching** to guide instructional strategies

5. Implementation and Monitoring:

- Action steps are implemented with fidelity and monitored using HRS leading and lagging indicators.
- Progress is tracked through classroom walkthroughs, PLC notes, student work samples, and assessment data.
- Stakeholders receive updates and provide feedback during SAC and staff meetings.

6. Review and Revision:

- The SIP is a living document. Based on progress monitoring protocols, the SLT and SAC revise strategies and supports as needed.
- Adjustments are made to ensure continuous growth and alignment with student needs.

Use of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is used to:

- Prioritize goals based on community and student needs
- Select evidence-based instructional strategies
- Design professional development
- Improve family engagement and communication
- Strengthen partnerships with local businesses and organizations

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

SIP Monitoring and Continuous Improvement Process

1. Regular Monitoring of Implementation and Impact

The SIP will be monitored through a structured, ongoing process that includes:

- **Monthly Leadership Team Meetings:** The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) reviews implementation data, including instructional walkthroughs, formative assessments, and progress toward SIP goals.
- **School Advisory Council (SAC) Reviews:** The SAC, which includes parents, students, staff, and community members, reviews progress and provides feedback.
- **Data-Driven PLCs:** Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) meet weekly to analyze student data, adjust instruction, and align practices with SIP goals.
- **Progress Monitoring Tools:** The school uses benchmark assessments, classroom-based assessments, and Marzano's High Reliability Schools (HRS) indicators to track progress.
- **Instructional Walkthroughs:** Administrators and coaches conduct regular walkthroughs using a rubric aligned with *The Art and Science of Teaching* to ensure high-quality instruction.

2. Focus on Students with the Greatest Achievement Gaps

- **Targeted Intervention Plans:** Students identified through data analysis as performing below grade level receive tiered interventions.
- **Equity-Focused Data Reviews:** Subgroup performance (e.g., ESE, ELL, economically disadvantaged) is disaggregated and reviewed regularly.
- **Progress Monitoring Protocols:** These students are monitored more frequently, and their data is reviewed biweekly in MTSS and PLC meetings.

3. Stakeholder Feedback and Plan Revisions

- **Feedback Loops:** Surveys, focus groups, and SAC meetings are used to gather input from all stakeholders, including students (mandatory for secondary), families, and community partners.
- **Transparent Communication:** SIP progress and updates are shared through newsletters, the school website, and town hall meetings.
- **Plan Revisions:** Based on stakeholder input and data trends, the SIP is revised at least twice annually. Revisions are documented and approved by the SAC.

4. Alignment with Continuous Improvement and Marzano HRS

- The SIP follows the **Continuous Improvement Model**: Plan → Do → Check → Act.
- **HRS Indicators** are used as a rubric to assess school-wide systems and instructional effectiveness.
- Instructional strategies are grounded in **The Art and Science of Teaching**, ensuring consistency and rigor across classrooms.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**MIDDLE/JR. HIGH** **6-8**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**NO**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**70.7%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**ATSI**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 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.*	**2024-25: B** **2023-24: B** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: A** **2020-21:**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment							340	379	375	1,094
Absent 10% or more school days							40	56	59	155
One or more suspensions							48	26	16	90
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							0	2	13	15
Course failure in Math							0	9	14	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							63	91	73	227
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							40	76	62	178
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2025-26

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							36	36	43	115

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year							0	0	3	3
Students retained two or more times							0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days							79	92	124	295
One or more suspensions							83	84	149	316
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							17	21	15	53
Course failure in Math							15	35	54	104
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							81	69	105	255
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							49	55	81	185
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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							36	50	73	159

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year									3	3
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	62	55	58	56	51	53	55	49	49
Grade 3 ELA Achievement			27			21			
ELA Learning Gains	58	57	59	52	53	56			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50	47	52	49	48	50			
Math Achievement*	65	61	63	63	58	60	66	57	56
Math Learning Gains	57	60	62	59	60	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56	55	57	57	60	60			
Science Achievement	55	50	54	50	46	51	53	44	49
Social Studies Achievement*	68	62	73	66	67	70	69	66	68
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration	85	85	77	71	80	74	92	84	73
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	59	50	53	61	46	49	53	39	40

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	62%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	615
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
62%	58%	62%	62%	57%		67%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	39%	Yes	3	
English Language Learners	47%	No		
Asian Students	74%	No		
Black/African American Students	44%	No		
Hispanic Students	60%	No		
Multiracial Students	62%	No		
White Students	66%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	62%		58%	50%	65%	57%	56%	55%	68%	85%			59%
Students With Disabilities	28%		34%	38%	34%	41%	36%	29%	38%	71%			
English Language Learners	34%		52%	55%	47%	56%	56%	17%	48%				59%
Asian Students	73%		68%		78%	58%		63%	86%	89%			
Black/African American Students	41%		41%	33%	38%	45%	49%	26%	59%	65%			
Hispanic Students	56%		59%	56%	65%	57%	57%	48%	61%	86%			56%
Multiracial Students	65%		51%	42%	59%	61%	54%	58%	79%	89%			
White Students	68%		62%	52%	72%	60%	59%	66%	71%	86%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%		51%	45%	51%	52%	52%	40%	57%	77%			53%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	56%		52%	49%	63%	59%	57%	50%	66%	71%			61%
Students With Disabilities	27%		44%	44%	32%	51%	52%	11%	39%	40%			
English Language Learners	43%		50%	46%	56%	60%	63%	40%	64%	69%			61%
Asian Students	79%		63%		86%	80%		86%	83%	100%			
Black/African American Students	31%		42%	38%	40%	51%	45%	21%	45%	61%			
Hispanic Students	50%		49%	45%	55%	57%	56%	41%	66%	52%			62%
Multiracial Students	66%		52%	57%	67%	59%	63%	79%	59%	81%			
White Students	61%		55%	57%	71%	60%	62%	55%	70%	77%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	43%		50%	48%	49%	56%	52%	35%	52%	52%			57%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%			53%
Students With Disabilities	17%				31%			10%	39%				
English Language Learners	36%				51%			45%	55%	90%			39%
Asian Students	77%				83%			47%	85%	93%			
Black/African American Students	31%				42%			18%	59%				
Hispanic Students	52%				62%			56%	56%	91%			38%
Multiracial Students	56%				67%			50%	79%	91%			
White Students	59%				71%			60%	74%	91%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	42%				54%			41%	55%	93%			38%

E. 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.

		2024-25 SPRING				
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	6	63%	55%	8%	60%	3%
ELA	7	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
ELA	8	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
Math	6	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Math	7	21%	36%	-15%	50%	-29%
Math	8	64%	58%	6%	57%	7%
Science	8	54%	48%	6%	49%	5%
Civics		65%	62%	3%	71%	-6%
Algebra		83%	56%	27%	54%	29%
Geometry		100%	53%	47%	54%	46%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Middle School Acceleration had the largest increase of performance. Burns had a 14% increase in performance from 23-24 to 24-25. The increase outperformed the district and the state. Middle school acceleration primarily refers to students passing high school End of Course Exams (Algebra, Algebra Honors, Geometry Honors). It also includes students that earned a certification in an industry certification exam in one of our career and technical HS elective courses. New actions taken in this area included a change in teacher assignments, curricular updates for students who progressed to Algebra from 7th grade regular, a clear focus on improvement in Algebra courses, district supports with curriculum, progress monitoring of student performance, PLC(Professional Learning Communities) and common planning work including targeted intervention and improvement plans to move students that were on the "bubble".
Other notable improvements were made in all content areas. English/Language Arts, Science, Social Studies and other math levels all demonstrated improvements from the previous year. Although, not as significant as the overall acceleration number all were significant in our total outcomes. Much of that is attributed to the increased collective efficacy of our faculty and efforts to plan together and reinvent our professional learning communities. All content areas had clear goals and used progress monitoring data to target areas where reteaching or further understanding was needed. We worked smarter.

Lowest Performance

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

Our Student With Disabilities according to the ESSA Federal Index which sets the performance index baseline at 41% was our lowest performing sub-group. Although our data shows an improvement from the previous year with a 1% increase from 38 to 39% we still fell under the 41% threshold. Contributing factors that helped improve our student performance was the work of our entire ESE team and faculty. We are trending upwards as a result of everyone's dedication to use date to target tier 2/3 interventions for students that need more. We also designed a different testing structure from PM 1 to PM3, created targeted plans to positively impact student achievement, and had a full team to provide supports.

Greatest Decline

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

Our English Language Learner Proficiency Performance decreased from last year from 61% to 59%. Contributing factors include lack of an ESOL Resource Teacher and a bi-lingual aide for almost the entire year. We have limited resources and few offerings for students to enhance their learning of the language and learn the standards associated with their performance. Teacher's use of resources to support our ELL population is trending upwards and should demonstrate improvement in overall student outcomes this year. We also have a bi-lingual aide heading into this year.

Greatest Gap

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 greatest gap from the state average was in social studies achievement. Specifically, our Civics achievement (68%) data showed a two percent overall increase from the previous year, however, the state had a significant increase and has an average of 73%. This is a 5% difference from the school's score average to the state's score average. The factors that could have contributed to the difference is we are in the beginning stages of a new curriculum and textbook adoption year. Teachers were still learning the enhancements TCI (Teachers Curriculum Institute) provided and the engaging lessons offered. Our Burns team of Civics teachers also a new team. Two of the three teachers were in their second year of teaching the curriculum and one was brand new to it. Overall, we improved and are trending upwards, however, we still have work to do in preparing our students.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

All of the areas are a concern. However, if decrease our number of chronic absentees we can impact all of the other performance factors. We have created an attendance improvement plan which incorporates a goal of decreasing our chronic absentees and increasing our Average Daily Attendance rate.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Quality Tier 1 instruction in all classrooms using progress monitoring data to differentiate. Use differentiation target tier 2/3 intervention strategies for ESE.
2. Plan for differentiated Professional Learning for faculty using PLCs, observations and feedback to guide improvement in practice.
3. Improve student average daily attendance rate to 92%

4. Refine practices surrounding PBIS to improve overall data in areas of student safety, responsibility and respect.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Professional Learning will be provided to support teachers in their efforts throughout the year. Professional Learning Communities and time for planning will be provided for teachers to common plan and to have district resource people to facilitate engaging lesson planning and demonstrate access to learning resources from the district.

Specifically, our Area of Focus will be determined by classroom walkthroughs and the use of our teaching rubric as it relates to our District's Model of Instruction. The four levers associated with it are based on Marzano's Research. The Four Levers for A Culture of Learning are Learning Environment, Demonstration of Learning, Content Alignment and Academic Ownership. We started last year with an emphasis on content alignment and moved towards student ownership as the year progressed. The shift was as a result of feedback from our walkthrough data. We have strong collaborative planning structures and systems and will leverage that to continue to look at building differentiated learning classrooms using the strategies to develop student ownership of their learning. All grade levels will be focused on the following elements within Academic Ownership:
1. All students are responsible for doing the thinking in the classroom.
2. Students make meaning of their learning through practice, deepening their understanding, collaborating with peers and applying their knowledge. (Last year's final look-fors centered around this element)

Professional learning will be enhanced through classroom modeling. Teacher talent developers will facilitate and organize classroom walkthroughs by other teachers based on the learning needs currently identified. At the beginning of the school year, for example, there will be walk throughs of classrooms where relationship building and classroom procedures are evident, and teachers can learn from one another in their practice and implementation of rules and procedures and building relationships.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Prior year data has been stated within this plan and specific measurable outcomes will be established by teachers within their Professional Learning Communities. The timeframe will be within the first few weeks after they return Aug. 1. As they plan using the most relevant data some content area can use PM1 and baseline performance data to gauge where students are and how to proceed. Some content areas such as science have similar curricular "big ideas" that surface throughout their three years in middle school and the teachers will review their data to determine their goals and strategies to move forward. All content areas will perform the same process and come up with their content area plan. Administration will be part of the process and provide oversight and require PLC logs to keep track of performance expectations and goal outcomes while also providing feedback and professional learning along the way. Overall, an expectation of seeing 90% of our classrooms demonstrating student collaboration and discourse will be achieved in a grade level classrooms.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Monitoring: Differentiation and specifically student academic ownership with collaboration and discourse will be monitored by observing student performance in classrooms. Professional learning will continue to be provided for teachers to engage students in collaborative learning structures and discourse. A classroom walkthrough Microsoft form will be created for administration, DRTs, TTDs and others to use to observe and collect data to see if evidence of implementation is taking place in 90% or more of the classrooms observed. Lookfors will consist of the following:

Cognitive Work - Students complete an appropriately challenging amount of cognitive work and engage in productive struggle at times throughout the lesson. Once released, students take ownership of the cognitive load.

Using Evidence in Responses - Students are using knowledge and evidence to form, articulate and defend their answers and opinions either orally or in written form.

Student Collaboration and Discourse - Students collaborate with pees and/or contribute to conversations with each other, including the use of academic vocabulary. Students respond to and build on their peers' thinking, ideas or answers. Students provide constructive feedback to their classmates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

The Principal with his Instructional Leadership Team will monitor progress.

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Grouping for discourse using organized method with clear structures - Starting with modeling and gradual release to spiral difficulty with scaffolding along the way. Ultimately, train students to grapple with content, use content vocabulary, challenge and support with evidence/reasoning.

Rationale:

To provide differentiated supports for those students that may need more of a guiding hand and explicit instruction paired with others that have the same struggle whereas they can build confidence together.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Define the expectation, model effective collaborative discourse group instruction for teachers, research benefits and steps to introduce. "Take the plunge" in an environment not worried about failing and try it.

Person Monitoring:

Coach/TTD/SAL/DRT

By When/Frequency:

within first two months of school

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

a model classroom with be used to demonstrate a way of implementing the intervention. Collectively teachers will discuss observation and relate to their classroom. TTD will follow up with support, modeling and coaching to assist in implementation of the intervention/strategy to increase student ownership.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Continue to provide tiered supports to students with IEPs. The rationale is that our students with disabilities have goals and strategies to intervene and provide supports to help make them successful. Our SWDs have increased in their overall performance level from last year, however, we still are not meeting the federal mandated requirement (floor of performance). By differentiating we can make all students more successful.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Progress monitoring systems should show learning growth for our SWD subgroup in each ELA/ reading teacher's classroom and math teacher's classroom. All teachers will know who their SWDs are prior to the start of school and will be knowledgeable of students IEP goals and supports needed during the first week of school.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

ESE Case Managers can provide communication of student IEPs with their case load teachers via email prior to the start of school. The ESE Specialist can monitor the completion of this communication.

Subgroup SWD data will be pulled for progress monitoring assessments to gauge learning by individual SWD. Monitoring will be implemented within content PLC. Administration will coordinate with individual teachers to review data and action steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

ESE Specialist and Administration

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

SWD students who are not showing growth will be pulled for small group instruction within the class period by Special Education teacher or General Education teacher to target areas of need on a weekly basis.

Rationale:

Small group instruction will provide differentiated, modeled instruction which can be more explicitly provided by educators and then monitored with formative assessments - "in the moment."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
General Education Teacher or Exceptional Student Educator	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Small group instruction once a week pertinent to area of weakness student is demonstrating after formative assessments demonstrate lacking skillset to identify for reteaching.

Action Step #2
All teachers increasing communication of instructional/behavioral progress of students in relation to their goals and interventions relative to students with disabilities. As the case manager is setting up parent engagement (IEP) meetings with members of the IEP teams for annual reviews the expectation is the case manager will have 100% of teachers participate in the IEP annual reviews through complete and accurate planning notes or physically participating in the IEP meeting. Keep in mind that student's learning goals should correlate to the appropriate staff at the IEP meeting. For example, the math teacher(s) should be present if a discussion of the child's math goal takes place. After such discussion the teacher(s) can be excused.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Case Managers/ESE Specialist	Every IEP meeting

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Case managers recognize and keep track of communication of planning notes and attendance at IEP meetings. Case managers must give prior notification to staff regarding IEP meetings and teachers can submit planning notes or participate at the IEP meeting. Case managers will notify through email of teachers who have not submitted planning notes or contributed to the required IEP meeting. Rationale: Increasing participation within the IEP meeting will provide more parent engagement within the instructional focus of the student with the disability. The school will monitor this monthly as a report from the ESE Specialist when she meets monthly with the principal.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student

learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

All grade levels will improve in their Average Daily Attendance rate to 92% or higher. In addition, the percent of students who are chronically absent will decrease by 10%.

The rationale for this area of focus is because our ADA is under 90% and our chronically absent students include more than 10% of our student body.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Measurable outcomes:
Check monthly to determine if we are meeting 92% ADA or better.
Check monthly to determine if less than 10% of our students are chronically absent - 2/3 days within the first 20 for example.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Ongoing monitoring with Tier 1 systems will improve overall school-wide attendance communication as HR teachers will monitor ADA within their first period. Steps to intervene early and often with communication, outreach and problem-solving solutions to start out the year will be vital to changing the trajectory of chronic absenteeism. Have those students that are a challenge and need tier 2 or 3 interventions quickly identified and provided an attendance intervention plan or home visit in order to troubleshoot reasons for not attending school on a regular basis. The School Leadership Team will review monthly attendance reports for ADA and those that are demonstrating trends for chronic absenteeism. PSLT will be referred students needing tier 2 interventions. Tier 3 interventions will be monitored by the social worker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

SLT - Tier 1 monitoring: PSLT - Tier 2 monitoring; Social Worker - Tier 3 monitoring

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

In the first 20 days identify any student who has missed two days and contact their parent/guardian to develop a connection to someone at school who will be responsible for overseeing the student's

attendance patterns. The homeroom teacher/first period teacher will be the responsible party to make parent contact, discuss challenges and encourage attendance. The teacher can refer students to guidance and then, PSLT/RTI after parent conference if attendance continues to trend downward. Survey respondents of chronically absent students for reason why they are absent and using the data improve obstacles to increase attendance: safety, belonging, connectedness, engagement, academic supports, emotional supports, etc. Use SLT and social worker to tier students and find out critical levers to support incentives to promote increased attendance.

Rationale:
If kids feel connected, see the value in attending, supported and safe then they will overcome challenges preventing them and attend regularly.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
First period/HR teacher monitors attendance. Contacts parent if student misses two days within first 20 days of school. Continue to monitor attendance and notify parents when absences accumulate. Document and refer to student services as needed. PSLT/RTI team becomes involved when student is trending toward chronic absences.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Teacher, student services, social worker	Teacher - Daily/weekly; Student Services - Monthly; Social Worker Weekly or daily for tier 3 students.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teacher - Daily/weekly; Student Services - Monthly; Social Worker Weekly or daily for tier 3 students. Students who have multiple early warning signs will be identified by school counselors and interventions will be in place to problem solve and use a solution focused appropriation to improving areas of concern. The school leadership team will monitor attendance monthly. The social worker will meet with the principal to discuss attendance (Tier 1, 2) monthly. The problem-solving leadership team will meet monthly to review Tier 2/3 interventions for students who previously were considered chronically absent.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSIor CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities) is a focus for our school last year and continues to be a focus. We improved 1% point from last year and will continue to provide targeted supports. Every year we review the data with our sub-groups. As we progress monitor our students with disabilities throughout the year we create targeted plans of support. The district engaged us in December of '24 to test all of our students with disabilities so that we could better program them for classes that are more appropriate to their cognitive abilities. The process of engagement resulted in training my staff to implement the test and then, how to read the results to better place students for the following 25-26 school year. We currently have the students with disabilities placed according to this diagnostic reading placement tool. The Assistant Principal for Curriculum then creates a master schedule that first starts with supports for our SWDs. A fully staff ESE team and general education faculty is ready to provide appropriate accommodations and scaffolding to support all students. We'll continue to monitor progress and modify plans as we learn and improve practices and strategies to meet the needs of our students with disabilities.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Rationale: If we practice an inclusive school experience for our students with disabilities and place students according to their correct reading or math level with supports and scaffolds our students with disabilities will meet grade level standards expectations. Although we progressed from 38 to 39% of our student's showing proficiency, we still are short of the federal benchmark of 41%. Our expectation is we will continue to improve and meet or exceed the 41% threshold by the end of the 2025-26 school year.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	**No**

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00