Putnam County School District

Mellon Learning Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mellon Learning Center

301 MELLON ROAD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/ehms

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Mellon Learning Center

301 MELLON ROAD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/ehms

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Eleanor H. Miller School is to foster an atmosphere of mutual respect among all stakeholders and create a positive learning environment in which students experience success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Special needs students should receive planned, varied, quality learning opportunities including functional skills instruction, which enable each student to reach their individual highest potential in achievement and self sufficiency.

Every student should be provided with opportunities to gain confidence and self-advocacy skills while acquiring the communication and social skills necessary for appropriate and responsible social behavior.

Families should be welcomed as partners in the educational process. They should be contributing members of the educational team charged with educating and advocating for their children. Families should be kept informed of available resources and all school activities.

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
Taylor, Tracy	Principal	To provide strategic direction of the school system. As Principal, oversees and develops standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Becker, Linda	Teacher, ESE	Quarterly meetings are held with teachers of IND, EBD, ASD, TBI, VI, and OHI students to discuss best instructional practices for their respective students. Teachers provide input on curriculum and professional development needs as well. This input helps guide our focus and implementation of strategies and curriculum. Individual student data is reviewed to monitor student progress.
Godfrey, Leither	Teacher, ESE	Quarterly meetings are held with teachers of IND, EBD, ASD, TBI, VI, and OHI students to discuss best instructional practices for their respective students. Teachers provide input on curriculum and professional development needs as well. This input helps guide our focus and implementation of strategies and curriculum. Individual student data is reviewed to monitor student progress.
Thompson, John	Assistant Principal	Enforcing attendance and disciplinary rules. Meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. Overseeing the safety and security of staff, students, and school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Tracy Taylor

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.*
0

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
12

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	4	3	10	1	8	6	12	11	6	9	12	8	21	111
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	2	5	6	12	6	6	7	7	3	5	61
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	2	2	6	4	4	1	1	1	2	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	3	6	3	3	1	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4	5	2	0	0	0	22

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	2	2	8	4	6	1	2	1	0	26

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	7

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/18/2020

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	2	6	1	8	7	12	14	9	11	10	10	10	15	115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	4	4	9	11	6	8	5	9	5	7	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	4	1	2	1	1	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	3	3	1	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	5	2	2	1	0	22

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	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	8

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	2	6	1	8	7	12	14	9	11	10	10	10	15	115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	4	4	9	11	6	8	5	9	5	7	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	4	1	2	1	1	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	3	3	1	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	5	2	2	1	0	22

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	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	8

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	0%	68%	61%	0%	73%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	52%	59%	0%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	63%	54%	0%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	57%	62%	0%	47%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	50%	59%	0%	33%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	40%	52%	0%	36%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	83%	56%	0%	89%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	93%	78%	0%	98%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	0%	41%	-41%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	43%	-43%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	42%	-42%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	38%	-38%	52%	-52%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	41%	-41%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	41%	-41%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	46%	-46%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	53%	-53%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	44%	-44%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	45%	-45%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	33%	-33%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	25%	-25%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	16%	-16%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	16%	-16%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	38%	-38%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	14%	-14%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	20%	-20%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	71%	-71%
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	51%	-51%	70%	-70%
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	43%	-43%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	42
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.

Approximately, 30% of EH Miller's student body have some type of Emotional Behavioral Disability. Of these students only 1 is academically on grade level. Students are placed at EH Miller when the IEP team determines they can not be successful in the general education population. The behavior of these students impacts their focus and attention on learning significantly. The data component showing the lowest performance was our EBD, who all but one comprise our BQ spots in all core areas: ELA, Science, Social Studies, and Math. Other contributing factors to this low performance are poor attendance and lack of motivation.

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

EH Miller's students tend to be consistent in their performance from year to year on statewide testing. Our students who are alternatively assessed may on occasion experience a slight drop in performance but this is generally tied to a change in teacher or teacher experience. Fortunately the teachers of these students tend to come to our school and stay for long periods of time.

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.

EH Miller EBD students with the exception of 1 are all in our BQ. Unfortunately this is not a new phenomenon. These students typically score a level 1 or 2 on statewide assessments. Within this group, they tend to score lower on assessments with a high demand for reading. The students who are at EHM and have been designated to have an EBD label, are here because they have exhausted the resources at general ed schools and have not been successful. These students lose a tremendous amount of class instruction because of their behavior. Their chronic behavior issues also result in multiple suspensions and high rates of absenteeism. All of these factors lead to the BQ having the largest gap when compared to the state average.

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

The data components showing the greatest improvement was students failing in reading or math. For the previous year that is reported there were 19, the last year of reporting this number dropped to 3. There has been a focused effort on ensuring students are on the correct academic path, are being taught using current standards based curricula, and with a higher degree of rigor. The previous administration and the current one have worked to ensure that now all secondary students are on the correct graduation path and that teachers understand the importance of teaching rigorous standards based lessons. The current administration is working with the district to obtain current curricula and to ensure EHM teachers are participating in relevant professional development.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1(D), the biggest area of concern is the percent tested. The last report indicates 93% of the students at EH Miller were tested. This seems low considering that alternatively assessed students are given a large window within which to complete their testing. The current administration is not aware of contributing factors which may have lead to this; but are making plans to implement some incentives and other measures to help increase the percentage of students tested.

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

1. Academic rigor and standards based instruction for all students.
2. Student and staff mental wellness.
3. Best strategies for improving the academic performance of our EBD students.
4. The health and safety of students and staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Staff and Student Mental Wellness

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Covid 19 pandemic has created a variety of trying situations for many of our staff and students. EBD students and students with other disabilities struggle emotionally and academically when there is a loss of structure as was experienced during the 5 months the students and staff were at home. Research has shown that people need to feel safe and sure of their basic needs being met before they are ready to learn/or to teach. When a conscious effort is made to consistently address the mental wellness of our students and our staff, there will be an increased focus on student rigor and engagement which will lead to improved student growth and achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	One measurable result of having an organized and consistent plan for addressing student mental wellness will be a decrease in the number of student referrals and a reduction in student absences. Students who are feeling safe, confident and empowered will be better able to handle conflict and focus on learning. A second measurable outcome will be a decrease in the number of staff absences over the course of the year as compared to the 2019-20 school. Employees who feel they are truly a contributing member of their work organization have fewer days missed than those who do not.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Thompson (j1thompson@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will be trained in handling student conflict through the Caring School and Community curriculum. This curriculum will be used daily in classrooms to help foster a sense of community and teach students to be accepting of others. District provided counselors will provide feedback and suggestions on ways we can support our most struggling students on a consistent basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Mental wellness is a basic foundation which must be in place for other positive things to happen. By providing training, monitoring for the use of curriculum to fidelity, and consistently offering appropriate supports to struggling students and staff we will create a culture where all stakeholders feel valued and committed to our causes. This will lead to increased rigor, focus on learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide a training for all staff on the implementation and use of the Caring Schools and Community curriculum. Have a staff member who is the designated liaison between the district and our school for updates related to the curriculum.
2. Monitor for program fidelity and implementation.
3. Using classroom walkthroughs and IObservation to provide coachings and support.
4. If needed provide in depth or individualized training.
5. Schedule bi-weekly meetings with mental health counselors to discuss struggling students and any needed supports.
6. Maintain open communication and encourage the sharing of ideas with students and staff.

Person Responsible	Tracy Taylor (ttaylor@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards-aligned instruction is directly related to academic growth and achievement. Research has also shown that even if students are significantly behind academically, the still need to be continually exposed to grade level instruction to help them close the gap.
Measurable Outcome:	Increasing the rigor of standards aligned instruction will have a direct impact on students scores on State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Taylor (ttaylor@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will attend all applicable district professional development related to standards based instructions. Plans will be monitored for adherence to district pacing guides. Administration will continue to work with district officials to identify key standards for all subjects so that teachers teaching multiple grade levels and courses can plan more effectively.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	E H Miller is a center school, the number of students and allocations necessitates teachers having multiple grade levels and to teach all subjects, it is therefore critical that teachers know and then plan to teach all critical standards associated with the courses they teach. Monitoring and coaching will be done using IObservation, professional development and support from district level coaches.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will continue to work with district level leaders to ensure we have proper curriculum, our teachers are offered support related to standards-aligned instruction.
2. Lesson plans will be monitored monthly for pacing and rigor.
3. IObservation will be used to coach and support teachers.

Person Responsible	John Thompson (j1thompson@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

EH Miller's identified Areas of Focus center on improved academic instruction coupled with teaching our students the necessary life skills to be successful in the world. Secondly, we will focus on the mental wellness of our students and staff.

The great majority of the students at EH Miller have significant academic gaps in their learning. These need to be addressed using standards based curriculum and consistently taught at the appropriate level of rigor. Administration is working with district leaders to acquire and train current materials for our teachers. We are also working on identifying key standards that must be taught since our teachers generally have four or more grade levels in their class and are required to teach all subject areas. Administration is also working to increase the level of accountability for all of our staff members as it relates to student instruction.

Other life skill challenges faced by our students are in the areas of self help skills such as dressing, toileting, feeding; job skills and finally managing of anger and conflict resolution. Our life skills focus are being addressed in the classroom, through VR, and grant from South Florida which is done in conjunction with Palatka High School. Students working on conflict resolutions and anger management are are using the Caring Schools and Communities curriculum which is taught daily.

While it would seem like the implementation of standards based lessons taught using curricula that is aligned to the standards would naturally lead to improved academic performance, this is frequently not the case for students who have emotional behavioral disabilities. These students are complicated in that they may have many issues contributing to their lack of academic growth. A few of these are attendance, motivation, learning issues; and anger management. In order to lay the ground work for rigorous instruction to be effective we must learn the triggering behaviors as well as what motivates our EBD students. The leadership team will meet and discuss these students along with their teacher and counselor. We will attempt to develop ongoing relationships with these students and their families to help bridge some of the factors leading to their poor performance. Where applicable we will attempt to find and utilize materials to help remediate their learning deficits. Finally we will work with the students to build an incentive program that the students will value and want to participate in.

The health and safety of our students and staff continues to remain at the forefront of every school administrator's priorities. School district are continually working on refining and improving drills, monitoring and training for catastrophic events such as intruders, weather emergencies and toxic spills. The Covid pandemic has added another layer of concern for the safety and health of staff and students. Throughout the summer, staff was trained, supplies purchased, and protocols developed to keep everyone as safe as possible. The students at EH Miller present some unique challenges to ensuring we keep students and staff safe. Some of these consist of tactile issues, lack of understanding of personal space, and for some increased risk due to their current medical status. The lead team works with teachers and staff to ensure that protocols are held in place and that they are not relaxed as time passes. We will do spot checks periodically to make sure we maintaining high standards of cleanliness. Students will be rewarded and praised for wearing their masks, hand washing, and maintaining the 6' rule.

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.

EH Miller works collaboratively with its stakeholders. Previously, we have had a campus that welcomes volunteers and other stakeholders on campus for meetings and other events. These stakeholders have consisted of church members, parents, business leaders, and students from one of the local high schools. Since the onset of Covid 19 we are having to work creatively to develop ways to maintain these very important relationships. Currently we are hosting quarterly Zoom meetings on varying days and times to make sure these stakeholders continue to feel like they have an opportunity to share ideas and discuss plans for our school. We utilize Facebook, call outs, and our district website to push out timely information related to EHM students, and events. This year we are encouraging parents to email or phone whenever they have a concern. We are very fortunate in the exceptionally strong ties we have with the majority of our parents. Because we are a center school, many of our students are here for their entire academic careers because of their special needs. These long term relationships foster open communication and a commitment to our school. Our staff is trained annually on the importance of maintaining positive daily communication with our parents They understand how important these relationships are to the success of our school. The administrative team works hard to model their commitment to EH Miller, there is literally no job they are unwilling to roll up their sleeves and help with. They believe strongly that a community that works together in all endeavors is the most positive foundation for trust, support and commitment to goals.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.