Putnam County School District

George C. Miller Jr. Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

George C. Miller Jr. Middle School

101 S PROSPECT ST, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/gcmms

Demographics

Principal: Tim Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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

George C. Miller Jr. Middle School

101 S PROSPECT ST, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/gcmms

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

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.

Our mission at George C. Miller Jr. Middle School is to ensure that all of our students are afforded the opportunity to achieve academic success in a safe, clean, and healthy learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At George C. Miller Jr. Middle School, all teachers and staff work together to plan for cognitively complex and relevant tasks and assessments through engaging student centered learning where all students are motivated and held responsible to a high level of autonomy.

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
Adams, Tim	Principal	Monitor and attend MTSS meetings when necessary and facilitate the completion of the SIP; disaggregate testing data to place students in appropriate academic classes, plan and monitor professional development and PLCs; conduct classroom observations in order to provide coaching and support; collaborate with team leaders, content area coaches, guidance counselors and the dean to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students and teachers. PBIS committee member.
Bender, Susannah	School Counselor	Schedule and facilitate ELL and 504 meetings and provide any pertinent data for the SIP, counsel with students who are struggling academically and/or have personal issues that are impeding their academic performance, provide student body with anti-bullying and suicide awareness training. PBIS committee member. Assessment Coordinator.
Adams, Paula	Assistant Principal	Monitor and attend MTSS meetings when necessary and facilitate the completion of the SIP; disaggregate testing data to place students in appropriate academic classes, plan and monitor professional development and PLCs; conduct classroom observations in order to provide coaching and support; collaborate with team leaders, content area coaches, guidance counselors and the dean to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students and teachers. PBIS committee member
Batchelor, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade ELA Teacher. Teaches ELA to 6th grade students.
Glover, Veronica	SAC Member	Self Contained ESE Teacher.
Bradford, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	8th Grade ELA Teacher.
Kubiak, Christa	Teacher, K-12	7th Grade ELA Teacher.
Ramirez, Elias	Dean	Behavior MTSS Coordinator. Social/Emotional Skills Coordinator for Small Groups based upon MTSS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Tim Adams

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	171	182	0	0	0	0	517
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	52	58	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	41	50	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	26	53	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	19	26	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	54	67	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	49	50	0	0	0	0	153

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	56	74	0	0	0	0	196

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	187	180	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	49	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	36	57	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	35	33	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	63	82	0	0	0	0	214

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	27	30	0	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	15

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	187	180	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	49	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	36	57	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	35	33	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	63	82	0	0	0	0	214

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	27	30	0	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	15

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	39%	39%	54%	27%	29%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	48%	54%	44%	44%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	47%	39%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	47%	43%	58%	36%	32%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	45%	57%	35%	34%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	51%	32%	31%	50%
Science Achievement	23%	25%	51%	20%	26%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	60%	72%	50%	54%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	42%	1%	54%	-11%
	2018	32%	42%	-10%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	38%	-2%	52%	-16%
	2018	29%	38%	-9%	51%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	35%	41%	-6%	56%	-21%
	2018	37%	47%	-10%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	45%	10%	55%	0%
	2018	51%	47%	4%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	33%	-2%	54%	-23%
	2018	22%	25%	-3%	54%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
08	2019	22%	16%	6%	46%	-24%
	2018	17%	16%	1%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	13%	14%	-1%	48%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	13%	20%	-7%	50%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	54%	8%	67%	-5%
2018	64%	58%	6%	65%	-1%
Compare		-2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	60%	-3%	71%	-14%
2018	61%	60%	1%	71%	-10%
Compare		-4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	49%	33%	61%	21%
2018	55%	43%	12%	62%	-7%
Compare		27%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	43%	45%	57%	31%
2018	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%
Compare		15%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	41	36	39	46	38	23	31			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	28	46	44	39	47	34	11	41	86		
BLK	29	45	33	34	41	26	10	48			
HSP	38	51	45	46	52	39	17	55	89		
MUL	56	39		67	72						
WHT	43	52	40	51	55	48	36	62	67		
FRL	38	49	37	47	53	40	21	52	81		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	9	33	38	32	50	51	10	61			
ELL	17	42	47	26	41	36	16	46	64		
BLK	30	51	56	31	44	27	7	60			
HSP	30	43	36	40	52	44	28	62	69		
MUL	53	54		38	43						
WHT	39	54	52	40	50	40	42	66	72		
FRL	31	46	43	38	52	39	24	59	68		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	35	29	27	41	31		24			
ELL	12	38	47	26	34	31	5	45	52		
BLK	15	26	16	28	33	20	25	29			
HSP	25	44	45	35	34	31	15	49	66		
MUL	33	73		50	55						
WHT	36	48	39	40	34	37	32	58	52		
FRL	24	42	39	33	34	31	20	47	59		

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
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	48
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.

Our 8th Grade Science Achievement had the lowest performance at 23%. This is a 7% decline from the 2019 to 2018 year. Our 8th Grade Science teacher left the school in December of 2019 and we had a teacher teaching science who was not certified within the science field. Our District Science Coach met with the teacher each week to plan meaningful lessons to support her instruction as well as support student understanding within the 8th Grade Science content. The principal and the assistant principal observed instruction, provided feedback, and coached the teacher in the following areas. The areas were: 1.Breaking down the standard 2.Building the Success Criteria 3.Target/task alignment 4.Student teaming techniques 5.Teacher monitoring/verifying of student learning based upon the Success Criteria. The administration also provided quarterly data chats with the teacher to discuss individual student data and how to best support individual students. Based upon the 2019 data our Science FCAT Achievement scores declined by 7% from the year prior, but it was still an increase of 3% from the 2017 data. Our biggest trend is finding qualified teachers who will remain at George C. Miller Jr. Middle School.

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

The Civics EOC data had the greatest decline from the prior year. For the 2019 school year, 56% of our students earned a level 3 or higher. This is a 8% decline from the 2018 school year. In looking at this data, we are comparing a different cohort of students from year to year. The 2019 teachers also taught Civics during the 2018 school year. We now have one new teachers teaching Civics for the 2020-2021 school year. Due to this factor, our Civics teachers are working closely with the district towards our Community PLC's that are taking place with other Civics Teachers to help provide support to one another.

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.

Our 8th Grade Science Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The gap between our Science Achievement and the state was at 28%. Our 8th Grade Science teacher left the school in December of 2019 and we had a teacher teaching science that was not certified within the science field. Our District Science Coach met with the teacher each week to plan meaningful lessons to support her instruction as well as support student understanding within the 8th Grade Science content. The principal and the assistant principal observed instruction, provided feedback, and coached the teacher in the following areas. The areas were: 1. Breaking down the standard 2. Building the Success Criteria 3. Target/task alignment 4. Student teaming techniques 5. Teacher monitoring/verifying of student learning based upon the Success Criteria. The administration also provided quarterly data chats with the teacher to discuss individual student data and how to best support individual students. Based upon the 2019 data our Science FCAT Achievement scores declined by 7% from the year prior, but it was still an increase of 3% from the 2017 data. Our biggest trend is finding qualified teachers who will remain at George C. Miller Jr. Middle School.

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

Miller Middle School's Math Achievement Component showed the most improvement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year of 8%. Miller Middle School's school administration hired a Highly Qualified 6th Grade Math Teacher who outperformed many within the district. We've lost that math teacher to a leadership position, however, we are excited to bring in 2 veteran math teachers who can provide stronger support to our students. The school also continued to double block as many math classes as possible to help provide core instructional support as well as remediation. We still also have a focus on the following areas of math instruction. They are:
1. Breaking down math standards to build standards based lessons.
2. Building of Success Criteria for each standard.
3. Target/task alignment
4. Team Techniques
5. Mini Lessons/Scaffolded tasks
6. Monitoring/Verifying student learning based upon standards based instruction.

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

Suspension is an area of concern. 113 of 557 students (20%) have had 1 or more suspensions for the 2018-2019 school year.
This EWS Data point is of significant importance as we have multiple school opening options. We must provide as much proper instruction as possible for all of our students regardless of what option the families select.

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

1. Students with Disabilities Subgroup.
2. African American Subgroup.
3. Science Achievement.
4. Social Studies Achievement.
5. Bottom Quartile Students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Effective Instruction and intervention in core academic areas to increase achievement and learning gains for all students, especially those in the students with disabilities subgroup.
	Even though Miller Middle School has improved and earned a School Letter Grade of "C", we still have underperformed in both achievement, learning gains, and bottom quartile in ELA, Math, and Science.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA Achievement by 5%. (39% to 44%) Increase ELA Gains by 5%. (50% to 55%) Increase ELA BQ by 5%. (41% to 46%) Increase Math Achievement by 5%. (47% to 52%) Increase Math Gains by 5%. (52% to 57%) Increase Math BQ by 5%. (52% to 57%) Increase Science Achievement by 12%. (23% to 35%) Increase Civics EOC Achievement by 5%. (56% to 61%) Increase Students with Disability subgroup by 6%. (35% to 41%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Adams (tadams@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement the following instructional practices to support and monitor student teaming structures to increase learning during core instruction. Common Board Configuration; Standards based instruction; Success Criteria to support student discourse; Teaming Techniques to support student discourse within deep conversations/debates/evidence based writing; teacher monitoring/verifying of student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our core instructional focus in teaming with our partnership of LSI is to stay standards focused, students using their Success Criteria for content conversations, team techniques for debates, appropriate social ways to agree/disagree; vocabulary/content conversations taking place within teams; student teams supporting each other in micro interventions; students providing evidence both in written and conversational form using multiple texts, as well as teachers/students monitoring/verifying student learning through the use of the Success Criteria.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Classroom Walkthroughs, Formal Observations, Informal Observations. (Coaching and evaluating teachers in their instructional practices.).
2.LSI Learning Walks; LSI Rigor Diagnostics (trend/growth data into teacher instructional practices)
3.iReady Diagnostics (given 3 times per year for Reading and given twice per year for Math.)
4.iReady Growth Monitoring Assessments
5.iReady Standards Mastery Assessments
6.Quarterly Review Meetings with teachers to analyze individual student data.
7.Return On Investment Data towards interventions
8.Mental Health Referrals and treatments to support removing barriers that effect student academic areas.
9.State Assessment Data
10. ALEX Progress Monitoring for Math
11. Performance Matters 8th Grade Science Progress Monitoring Assessments

12. Differentiated PD for teachers at Miller based upon their prescription needs.
13. Grade level and Content area PLC's.
14. School wide AVID organizational structures

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Suspension is an area of concern. 113 of 557 students (20%) have had 1 or more suspensions for the 2018-2019 school year.
This EWS Data point is of significant importance as we have multiple school opening options. The school leadership team will ensure teachers are providing as much proper instruction as possible for all of our students regardless of what option the families select.

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.

George C. Miller Jr. Middle School has a high Hispanic population. Efforts are made to send parent communication home in both English and Spanish. The weekly "Watch for it Wednesday" is sent home in a bi-lingual format. Efforts are made to hold parent meetings at different times, so parents will have the opportunity to participate without the loss of employment opportunities. In addition, bilingual assistance will be offered at parent events and meetings. Many activities are designed to enhance the cultural backgrounds of the students and parents.

The following activities are planned for parent involvement:
Open House September 25, 2020 (Virtually).
21st Century After School Program to enrich student learning through STEAM Projects. (Robotics, Photography, Art. Starts on Monday, August 31st.)
AVID School Wide Components . (Organizational Binders)
Student Led Parent/Teacher Conferences
Cambridge Acceleration Course Updates
2nd Tuesday of every month is Coffee with the Principal. (Virtually)
Parent Reading Information Night November 2017. (Virtually)
Band Nights 2020/2021 (Christmas/Spring Concerts)

Honor Roll Mornings held quarterly
Perfect Attendance & 90% Attendance Mornings
SAC Committee Meetings
Parent Academic Information Night
Student of the Month Nights hosted by the City of Crescent City
JFG Virtual visits
8th Grade College Visits to St. John's State College as well as to the University of North Florida. (Spring 2021)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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