Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/miller

Demographics

Principal: Debra Riley

Start Date for this Principal: 9/7/2021

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/miller

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

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 Jessie P. Miller Elementary is to build a strong foundation for the love of learning that encourages students to achieve at their highest potential occurring within a community of collaboration and support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jessie P. Miller takes pride in its long-standing tradition of providing a positive, nurturing learning environment for generations of local families.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Riley, Debra	Reading Coach	
Deleo, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Potter, Katelyn	Other	
Harrison, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Aviertt, Kristina	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/7/2021, Debra Riley

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

Total number of students enrolled at the school
591

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	97	98	96	106	94	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/7/2021

2020-21 - 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	85	90	102	105	85	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	6	16	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	5	5	10	13	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	2	2	12	14	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	2	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	85	90	102	105	85	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	6	16	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	5	5	10	13	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	2	2	12	14	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	2	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				56%	52%	57%	56%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	57%	58%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	55%	53%	48%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	63%	63%	62%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	68%	62%	56%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	53%	51%	48%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	48%	53%	58%	49%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	69%	65%	4%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grades 1-2: iReady Diagnostics for ELA/Math
Grades 3-5: iReady Diagnostics for ELA/Math and District Benchmark Assessments
Grade 5: FSA ELA/Math Assessment

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102/16%	102/35%	92/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/13%	62/36%	58/55%
	Students With Disabilities	20/5%	20/10%	18/17%
	English Language Learners	17/12%	18/28%	15/40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102/13%	102/31%	91/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/11%	62/23%	57/44%
	Students With Disabilities	20/5%	20/5%	17/24%
	English Language Learners	17/0%	18/22%	15/33%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	120/19%	117/39%	113/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/16%	86/36%	382/54%
	Students With Disabilities	28/4%	28/25%	27/44%
	English Language Learners	17/12%	17/12%	17/24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	119/13%	117/32%	113/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	87/9%	86/23%	82/44%
	Students With Disabilities	28/7%	28/11%	27/30%
	English Language Learners	17/0%	17/12%	17/18%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	110/40%	104/53%	94/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/32%	71/42%	66/53%
	Students With Disabilities	37/19%	32/19%	30/27%
	English Language Learners	10/30%	9/56%	8/63%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	109/14%	94/27%	100/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/8%	67/21%	69/33%
	Students With Disabilities	36/0%	30/3%	31/13%
	English Language Learners	10/30%	8/13%	9/22%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	94/45%	97/55%	94/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63/35%	65/46%	63/51%
	Students With Disabilities	24/33%	22/32%	23/35%
	English Language Learners	10/30%	12/33%	10/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84/35%	94/56%	93/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54/22%	62/45%	63/41%
	Students With Disabilities	21/10%	20/50%	21/33%
	English Language Learners	7/14%	12/42%	12/33%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	91/64%	93/58%	80/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/60%	60/57%	
	Students With Disabilities	8/25%	8/38%	
	English Language Learners	12/42%	14/50%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93/63%	94/57%	79/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/58%	61/51%	
	Students With Disabilities	9/22%	9/22%	
	English Language Learners	13/46%	14/57%	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	94/60%	94/49%	79/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/55%	61/41%	
	Students With Disabilities	10/40%	9/33%	
	English Language Learners	14/36%	14/21%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27	45		35	45						
ELL	38	45		46	50						
BLK	24			39							
HSP	38	40		48	55		39				
MUL	61			56							
WHT	66	53	20	72	70	45	78				
FRL	44	40	31	53	63	73	55				
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	32	46	46	34	58	50	11				
ELL	32	33	18	37	60	58	29				
BLK	24	45	55	41	50	45	20				
HSP	43	48	35	55	65	47	44				
MUL	59	63		50	58		50				
WHT	66	52	50	78	71	48	63				
FRL	49	53	48	61	64	52	45				
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	30	48	36	41	55	46	33				
ELL	38	55	47	51	58	46	36				
BLK	31	48		39	43		31				
HSP	45	53	42	58	58	43	48				
MUL	58	59		63	71						
WHT	64	61	48	68	56	48	67				
FRL	47	49	49	56	55	51	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Grade 1: ELA- The ELL and ED subgroups score comparable to all students. The SWD group scored significantly lower. Math- All subgroups scored significantly lower than all students tested.
Grade 2: ELA- The ED subgroup scored comparable to all, and SWD group scored significantly lower. Math- Same as Grade 1.
Grade 3: ELA scores trend upward across the year. The ELL subgroup is comparable to all students. Math- upward trend in scores across the year.
Grade 4: ELA- upward trend in scores across the year. All subgroups score significantly lower than all students. Math- same as Grade 4 ELA.
Grade 5: ELA- ED and Ell subgroups scored similar to all students. Math- same as ELA

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off of progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment data, the SWD subgroup demonstrates the greatest need for improvement in both ELA and Math. These students tend to be part of our L25, along with students in the ELL and ED subgroup, so a goal will be written to address this need.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

These students have significant struggles with learning. Those identified as ELL will be provided a daily time to work on Imagine Learning in the lab for tiered interventions. The SWD students are accommodated within the classroom and by VE Resource teachers in the area of need. We will also create test prep groups prior to FSA to assist these students with how to answer particular question stems.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, our 5th grade math scores showed the highest levels of improvement with an increase of 17% from the previous year's assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The 5th grade teachers paid very close attention to the math standards and test item specifications for each standard. They participated in TCT's to analyze data after each benchmark assessment to notice trends and areas of need. We also implemented a small group instructional design structured to target students who may need assistance and can gain the most from decomposing FSA style questions to determine the most appropriate plan for solving them. Last year, we also implemented Acaletics in 4th and 5th grade to assist with raising the level of student achievement in math.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue to provide quarterly planning days to grade level teams to assist teachers with lesson design around standards to be addressed each quarter. We will continue to implement Acaletics in 4th and 5th grades. We will also introduce Acaletics to our 3rd grade students this year to address the need in that grade level for math acceleration.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Quarterly planning days, lead by the Instructional Coach, will allow time for needed PD. We will take advantage of our Acaletics rep to assist us with PD for our 3rd-5th grade teachers. Our 3rd grade teachers will be provided an opportunity to participate in an instructional round to see Acaletics implemented within the classroom.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In addition to what was mentioned in Box G, we are also working with our 3rd grade team to adapt lessons to meet the needs of our current learners. We have purchased some additional resources for them to use in the classroom. We will plan to have demonstration lessons set up upon the arrival of the materials so that they can see the teaching in action.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our L25 students struggle and show low performance in ELA in grades 3-5 on the FSA. While our teachers are proficient in identifying students who fall into this subgroup, the interventions they provide are not always matched specifically to student need. Our FSA scores in ELA for this subgroup dropped from 48% to 29% last school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, our L25 students will increase their ELA learning gains from 29% to 40% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	We will use the quarterly district benchmark assessments as our progress monitoring tool to determine progress toward this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of quarterly benchmark assessments. Data analysis of quarterly Next Steps Reading assessments and Words Their Way spelling inventories to group students for small group instruction based on specific learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school utilizes LLI as the primary intervention for students identified as Tier 2 through MTSS. While the program is highly effective and research based, our students are not exiting the program in a timely manner. Data analysis of benchmark assessments and iReady suggest that our L25 students lack the phonemic awareness skills needed to grow as readers. Our intention is to have teachers use data gleaned from the Next Steps reading assessments and spelling inventories to group students for intervention based on need and not solely on reading level.

Action Steps to Implement

All students are assessed using the Next Steps reading assessment quarterly. Teachers will complete and submit a Progress Monitoring Data Sheet used to track student data across all assessments throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

PD provided to teachers during quarterly planning days to properly analyze data given from the Next Steps assessments and spelling inventory results. Grade levels are provided time to plan for intervention instruction and grouping students based on need.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

Instructional Leadership Team meetings are scheduled monthly to analyze student data as scheduled on the schoolwide assessment calendar and assessment matrix.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Monitoring of weekly lesson plans in PlanbookEdu to ensure that teachers are upholding standards based lesson plans created during quarterly planning days.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA data, our 3rd grade students scored much lower than our 4th and 5th grade students in math. Third grade achievement was at 48% as compared to 71% in 4th grade and 68% in 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, the 3rd grade students will increase their math achievement from 48% to 65% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using quarterly district benchmark assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year, we are purchasing Acaletics for our 3rd grade students to use in addition to standards-based instruction. Third grade students will participate in a daily Math Club for Acaletics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We saw a strong correlation between our Acaletics data and our FSA data last year with 4th and 5th grades. To help our third grade teachers to close the gap, we purchased Acaletics for them to use this year as an additonal instructional resource.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Leadership Team meetings scheduled monthly to analyze data as scheduled on the schoolwide assessment calendar and assessment matrix.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Teachers complete and submit math data on the Progress Monitoring Data Sheet.

Goal Setting with all students is an expectation at Miller.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

Initial PD provided to 3rd grade team to introduce the Acaletics program. Teachers participate in instructional rounds to observe Acaletics in action.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Quarterly collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

Monthly Acaletic Scrimmage data review to monitor student progress and group student based on performance.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA Federal Index has identified our Black/African American subgroup as felling below the Federal Index of 41%. Currently our Black/African American subgroup is just below the target by 1%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, our Black/African American subgroup of students will increase their achievement as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment so that the ESSA Federal Index score rises to 41% or higher.
Monitoring:	Quarterly benchmark data will be monitored for this subrgoup's performance levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA- analysis of Next Steps, Words Their Way, iReady and quarterly benchmark assessment data. Math- daily math instruction aligned with the district maps, Math in Practice utilized and Acaletics daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our Black/African American students will be monitored closely, just as we do for other subgroups in ELA and Math to ensure that students' areas of need are addressed through specific, targeted small group instruction. Students in this subgroup should be provided small group instruction, as needs arise, so that students in this subgroup can achieve at their highest levels of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Next Steps assessments quarterly. Acaletic scrimmages monthly. Data tracked on Progress Monitoring Data Sheet.

Person Responsible Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

Small groups created based on areas of need based on assessment data.

Person Responsible Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

Instructional Leadership Team meetings scheduled monthly to analyze data as scheduled on the schoolwide assessment calendar.

Person Responsible Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus Area 2: Strengthen Adult SEL Competency and Capacity on a rubric provided by the district to determine our school implementation of SEL in four focus areas was used to identify as an area in need of improvement at our school.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, at least 50% of our teachers will model strengthened adult SEL competency and capacity by fostering a culture of appreciation, collaboration and support as evidenced by their participation in quarterly SEL staff challenges.
Monitoring:	Each quarter, the SEL Team will create a staff challenge from the Purposeful People program for staff to participate in throughout the quarter. This will be monitored by tracking the number of staff who participate in the challenge. At the end of each quarter, the SEL team will send out a confidential survey to staff to evaluate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katelyn Potter (potter3k@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff challenges will be used from Purposeful People, part of the district adopted Character Strong program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected based on data taken from the School Implementation Rubric of SEL prepared by the district for each school to self-evaluate each of the four focus areas: Build Awareness/Create a Plan, Strengthen Adult SEL, Promote SEL for Students and Practice Continuous Improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

SEL Team will meet monthly to review the monthly character trait focus for students to create a staff challenge for each quarter.

Person Responsible	Katelyn Potter (potter3k@manateeschools.net)

Staff will be surveyed quarterly to evaluate their SEL competency.

Person Responsible	Katelyn Potter (potter3k@manateeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Miller Elementary 20-21 School Grade proficiency in ELA was a total of 54%. The grade level totals were as follows: Grade 3 -45% Grade 4 -56% Grade 5 -63%. Grade 3 scored below 50% which results in Miller being added to the RAISE Schools in the state of Florida. In addition, Miller Elementary 3rd grade ranked Miller as 24th in the district when being compared to 33 elementary schools.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, the grade 3 ELA proficiency percentage will increase from 45% to 58% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment .
Monitoring:	We will use the quarterly district benchmark assessments as our progress monitoring tool to determine progress toward this goal. We will also utilize school-based progress monitoring using the Florida Practice Coach as a common resource to assess comprehension and stamina.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of quarterly benchmark assessments & iReady Data analysis of Student Comprehension Tests
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of benchmark assessments and iReady suggest that our grade 3 readers are lacking skills in vocabulary and comprehension . Our intention is for teachers to plan and implement a purposeful instruction for Tier 1 to meet the needs of the readers. Rime Magic will be implemented in every Grade 3 Word Study block for each classroom to increase confidence with vocabulary and word meanings. Comprehension will be supported in whole group, small group, and individual conferences to assure each reader's gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Rime Magic into Word Study (Tier 1) for each Grade 3 Classroom. Training for Rime Magic will be provided at the first quarter quarterly planning date (PLC). Mrs. Barringer will model the word study program for the team of teachers at the PLC. Two additional kits will be ordered to implement the program.

Person Responsible   Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Florida Practice Coach will be ordered to provide an additional comprehension instructional tool for each grade 3 classroom. The bundle will increase comprehension practice aligned to the Florida Standards in whole group and in a small group setting. On the 2nd quarter Team Planning Date (October 5th), Christine France will visit from Palma Sola Elementary to model how she has used this resource effectively the past 5 years. Teachers will review student samples from France's class to show the expectations of the reader established by the educator.

Person Responsible   Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will review data for comprehension tests in the classroom and within the district. Standards will be reviewed as a group. Reading Stamina will be intentionally built in the classroom evident with student goal setting . TCT Meetings will support the strengths and the needs analysis for instruction.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

At the end of the 20-21 school year, 153 student referrals were written. The behavior code with the highest number of referrals was aggression (61 referrals). The second highest number of referrals was written for Inappropriate Behavior (25 referrals). The grade level with the highest number of referrals written was Kindergarten (35 referrals).

To monitor this and in an effort to see a decrease this school year in the number of referrals written, we will discuss monthly referral data at ILT meetings. We have also rewritten the Miller School Pledge this year to update it to be more relevant to the students we serve. We are also having quarterly incentives for students who earn all S's or E's on their report cards in the Responsibilities of the Learner section. We are reestablishing the PBS committee at our school. Teachers on the committee created skits at the beginning of the year to model the new student pledge. Teachers and students collaborate to create classroom rules based on the pledge. They also write classroom mission statements together which are posted inside and outside of each classroom.

Dr. Wilhoit was invited to speak to grade 4 and grade 5 students about bullying and the importance of reporting for saftey across our campus. Posters were placed in all vestibules KG - GR 5 to See It, Hear It, Report it. Both of the above improvements were in response to the more serious discipline issues from last year's data.

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.

1. SAC/PTO comprised of teachers, administrators, staff members, parents and community members meet every other month to coordinate events/opportunities and to provide outreach to all stakeholders to become involved in our school community.
2. The Blackboard Connect program is used to sent outreach messages to our broader school community to keep them updated regarding important school information/events.
3. The school marquee is updated bimonthly with important dates/events.
4. The school website and Facebook page is updated frequently with school event information.
5. The Peachjar program is used to communicate flyer information that was originally sent home via paper copies in student backpacks.

6. Teachers communicate with families through the use of agendas, social media apps, emails and text messages.
7. The school holds several events throughout the year to invite family involvement: Literacy Night, Math/ STEM Night, Valentines Dance, etc.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers- establish classroom expectations/routines for behavior and learning. They communicate this to parents along with individual student progress.
Students- perform to the best of their abilities and work with parents/teachers to ensure learning is taking place.
Families- communicate openly with teachers and administration about their child's needs. Families support the learning focus at the school.
Volunteers- (when safe for them to be on campus) Assist teachers with clerical and or support of student learning.
School Board members- visit the school to determine the needs of the school and to build relationships with the school community.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00