
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Virgil Mills Elementary School

7200 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/mills>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mills Elementary is a school where staff members value children and make learning a high priority. Students experience a high engagement learning environment where teachers use meaningful content. Students achieve mastery, reason, make judgments, think critically, and acquire and evaluate new information

Provide the school's vision statement.

To implement a student-centered, standards-based, rigorous teaching and learning process that will positively impact all student learning.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mennes, James	Principal	Administration
Collett, Felicia	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

At Mills Elementary the SIP is developed with the input of our administrative leadership team, two (2) PTO parents and our SAC Chair (Steven Marraro). Our prior year SIP is reviewed and adjustments are implemented to assure compliance and academic growth.

SIP Monitoring

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

Our SIP is post and reviewed by our Instructional Leadership Team(ILT) quarterly and is an agenda topic on our SAC assigned meeting dates.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	41	27	40	29	31	41	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	4	16	18	0	0	0	49
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	17	4	6	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	6	8	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	23	17	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	31	21	15	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	34	32	41	27	23	0	0	0	172

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	29	31	41	0	0	0	101

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	43	29	40	32	44	33	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	8	6	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	7	8	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	25	15	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	24	12	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	27	41	40	37	25	0	0	0	188

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	43	29	40	32	44	33	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	8	6	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	7	8	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	25	15	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	24	12	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	27	41	40	37	25	0	0	0	188

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60	51	53	63	55	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				57			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			38		
Math Achievement*	68	62	59	74	50	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				77			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			50		
Science Achievement*	56	51	54	61	65	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	59	59	78			62		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	2	2
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	49			
HSP	56			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	62			
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	60			68			56					68
SWD	27			33			24				4	
ELL	21			32							3	68
AMI												
ASN	79			86							2	
BLK	43			43							3	
HSP	51			55			38				5	67
MUL	56			56							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			76			63				4	
FRL	46			53			48				5	68

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	63	57	37	74	77	53	61					78
SWD	20	32	30	40	50	33	11					
ELL	21	32	18	35	59	54	18					78
AMI												
ASN	77	64		77	91							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	51	70		53	68	67	64					
HSP	47	36	8	61	67	57	50					67
MUL	74	60		83	93							
PAC												
WHT	68	60	47	80	79	39	61					
FRL	50	49	29	62	71	49	41					69

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	66	53	38	70	70	50	61					62
SWD	33	31	30	38	46	36	26					
ELL	36	56	50	42	59	36	29					62
AMI												
ASN	68			79								
BLK	59	31		47	71		42					
HSP	64	53	36	55	66	42	57					67
MUL	64	50		85			55					
PAC												
WHT	68	55	42	75	73	58	65					
FRL	62	52	43	66	69	50	61					46

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	47%	21%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	62%	12%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	51%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our lowest performance and greatest need for improvement is with our L25 and ELL learning gains in ELA.

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

Greatest decline again was our ELL.
 Our ELL is a fairly transient population and tends to not start at the beginning of the year. Parental involvement/support is minimal as well. Most also do start the year knowing little to no English. We are working on a stronger connection with these families to assist where ever needed.
 We are also working ob a better alignment for ELA tier 2 and 3 resources as well as time for staff training to meet these needs. This will also be a topic of conversation at our ILT Meetings.

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.

Mills Elementary data consistently resembles state data scores. We do score slightly higher in math and slightly lower in the ELL category.

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

We had strong Math learning gains at all levels. This is most likely related to the adoption of 3rd - 5th grade accelerated math and the Accoletics program.

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

Early on tier intervention will be a key factor in decisions we make this year. Our assessments this year will be closely reviewed and that information will drive our process for these EWS students.

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

Last year we planned on having grade level academic planning days and several other school adopted support for our staff. Our district implemented several other new initiatives that took precedent. Staff moral dropped with these numerous changes. this year it is possible as well as the implementation of morning Number Talks, Accaleoics trainings, ESOL accommodation trainings and MILLS POWERS (life skill trainings).

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on historical data and past year FSA scores, ELA is our greatest need for growth. This area impacts all grade levels with an emphasis on our L25 students and their success. SWD and ELL are represented in this group as well. Past benchmarks, iReady and other assessments demonstrate the need to support these groups as compared to non ELL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Mills Elementary School will show learning gains of 10% over the three progress monitoring assessments during the 2023-2024 school year for our L25 students. This will be measured from Progress Monitoring One (PM1) to Progress Monitoring Three (PM3).

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our L25 student learning gains by benchmark assessments, ILT meetings, tier 2 and 3 data as well as teacher small group meetings and collaborations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Mennes (mennesj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Lexia, Benchmark Advance , SIPPS and Imagin Learning are all used for evidence based interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All are district assigned and our focus again will be small group targeted reading intervention grouping. Emphasis on differentiated instruction to meet all student needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

CHAMPS is a critical tool to support the need to have students succeed academically by keeping them learning and growing in the classroom instead of ISS or OSS. We have identified this as a need through our ILT looking at school discipline data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will have a reduction of 10% in referrals by providing consistency and fidelity of instruction by collaborating and building relationships with students using the CHAMPS model to help students succeed.

Monitoring:

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

We have created a new school wide pledge inline with CHAMPS for morning announcements. Schoolwide reminders posted of student expectations. Behavior Grade Level Contracts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Hart (hartm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

CHAMPS is a district adopted program with a variety of Life Skill resources that can utilized at all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CHAMPS is a district adopted program with a variety of Life Skill resources that can utilized at all grade levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Morning Mills Pledge - ALL
Grade level Behavior Contracts
Administration recognizing students who exemplify character trait of the month.
Postings of student expectations.
Behavior data reviews quarterly to adjust where needed.

Person Responsible: Michele Hart (hartm@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly check-in and reviews