Miles Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miles Elementary School

317 E 124TH AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carla Nolan   Start Date for this Principal: 1/26/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Hillsborough 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.](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

Miles Elementary School

317 E 124TH AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	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	92%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Everyone learns every day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Miles community is committed to preparing students for a lifetime of resilience and success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nolan, Carla	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/26/2022, Carla Nolan

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school
672

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	93	106	109	137	94	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	43	59	33	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	52	51	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	119	121	113	151	110	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	61	55	46	60	38	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	48	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	46	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	33	50	63	33	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	267

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	119	121	113	151	110	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	61	55	46	60	38	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	48	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	46	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	33	50	63	33	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	267

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	53%	56%				29%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						45%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	50%	50%				26%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						36%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						33%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	59%	59%				31%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	24%	52%	-28%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	55%	-25%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	26%	54%	-28%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	24%	54%	-30%	62%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	26%	57%	-31%	64%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					
	2019	19%	54%	-35%	60%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	8	42	45	17	51	28	7				
ELL	27	64	53	47	71	46	20				
BLK	16	58	67	22	57	46	14				
HSP	27	60	52	46	70	46	24				
MUL	42	40		33	60						
WHT	45	67		39	39						
FRL	25	60	56	37	64	44	21				

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	6	25	42	15	33	17					
ELL	25	38	55	29	58	31	17				
BLK	13	29		16	26		5				
HSP	23	41	62	28	63	43	20				
MUL	29			21							
WHT	37	60		41							
FRL	21	39	48	26	53	38	17				
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	12	46	48	13	35	31	7				
ELL	26	43	33	27	35	27	22				
BLK	26	56	65	13	34	52	32				
HSP	29	42	38	29	36	23	28				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	32	56		33	42		33				
FRL	29	46	45	26	36	33	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	49
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	40
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	48
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	44
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 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	48
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our reading proficiency is low across the grade levels and this has an impact on our science proficiency percentages. In addition, our bottom quartile of math students did not make as much gains as our bottom quartile of reading students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading and Science proficiency

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

Students coming into intermediate grades significantly behind grade-level. To address this, we purposely plan whole-group and small-group instruction in common planning and PLCs. In addition, we have extra support in pulling small groups of students who show that they need extra help.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains

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

We focused on data analysis and action planning around individual student needs.

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

More small group planning and data analysis PLCs after big assessments

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.

Data dives with academic coaches, best practices in student discussion to get the students thinking about the content at deeper levels, and standards analysis as needed for teachers to understand the depth of the standards and how to teach it.

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

Job-embedded Professional Development to develop the teacher capacity throughout the year

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With the adoption of new standards and new curriculum simultaneously, it is important for our teachers to understand the meaning of the standards and the pedagogical practices that foster the best student outcomes to master the standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is for 48% of the students at Miles to be on grade level on the diagnostic 3 iReady as well as the states FASST assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will take the iReady and FASST Assessment will be administrator 3 times during the course of the year and the administrative team will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure that teacher delivery of lessons is meeting the depth of the standard and utilizing best practices as described in Hattie's Visible Learning research.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Each grade level K-5 will have common planning sessions using a district developed protocol facilitated by school based coaches assigned to the content. Teachers will be required by complete pre-work designed by coaches. During planning sessions coaches will support teachers in planning lesson delivery aligned to the standards and targeting best practices aligned to Hattie's research.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers are new to the standards and resources being utilized. Therefore ongoing planning support is needed to prepare teachers for high quality instructional delivery aligned to standards. Followed by ongoing coaching and PD as needed based on walkthrough trends.

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.

Reading, Math and Science Coaches will meet with teachers in all grade levels weekly in order to support the development of high quality lesson plans aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible   Carla Nolan (carla.nolan@hcps.net)

Administrative team will conduct walkthroughs bi-weekly to observe the transfer of plans to practice and collect trends that will allow the team to design professional development based on teachers needs

Person Responsible   Carla Nolan (carla.nolan@hcps.net)

Administration and coaches will provide teachers with professional development sessions based on students needs focused on the high quality instructional practices and deepening of the standards.

Person Responsible   Carla Nolan (carla.nolan@hcps.net)

Coaching cycles will be conducted by coaches with teachers based on walkthrough trends, student achievement data and teacher tiers throughout the school year.

Person Responsible   Carla Nolan (carla.nolan@hcps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers will increase their teaching of foundational skills and phonics in small group instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers will utilize small group instruction to narrow the achievement gap of students who come in reading below-grade level.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will increase our number of students scoring "on-grade level" on the iReady diagnostic to 75% in phonics by the 3rd Diagnostic in May.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will increase our number of students scoring "on-grade level" in comprehension on the iReady diagnostic to 50% by the May Diagnostic 3.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use the first two iReady diagnostic tests to place students in appropriate groups and action plan with Reading coaches on how best to instruct each of the groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Heinzman, Heather, heather.heinzman@sdhc.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Small group instruction is included in the District's Evidence-based reading plan and teaching phonics and foundational skills directly aligns with the B.E.S.T. standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Small group instruction will directly address the identified need by focusing on developing specific skills for the groups of students in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Plan for instruction with the reading coach	Hense, Jennifer, jennifer.hense@hcps.net
Data Dives to identify how to shift or evolve the focus of small-group instruction	Heinzman, Heather, heather.heinzman@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Miles Elementary strives to create a positive school culture and environment by beginning with a clear vision and mission statement supported by intentional and purposeful school wide expectations. All staff members are well versed in the basics of Positive Behavioral Support and Interventions (PBIS) which helps to build the strong foundation for all of our work together. We know that each of our Mustangs enters a psychologically and physically safe environment where "everyone learns everyday", and that includes the faculty and staff! Team building from day one contributes to our strong social relationships and in turn builds

great human capacity for the hard work that we invite each day. There are opportunities for teams to collaborate in team planning, PLCs, shared lunchtime, and thematic celebrations designed to promote a positive culture such as our Women's History Month, our Ring of Champions Celebrations highlighting outstanding educators, Literacy and Math/Science nights and much more. Sacred time is allotted to build social and emotional literacy as well evident through our devotion during pre-planning to time spent working on social and emotional learning not only for children but for adults as well. Each faculty member was given the opportunity to attend a 6 -hour training based on Brene Brown's Atlas of the Heart during which the focus was on building stronger and more meaningful connections. This year we have implemented a House System for our 5th grade team to further promote a sense of belonging and community. All teachers are a part of this system as well and offer an additional layer of mentoring and support for all of our students to reach their full potential academically and emotionally. Each day begins with friendly greetings and a morning meeting designed to capture the pulse of all of our students and to gauge the most positive and productive manner in which to begin our days. Students are rewarded through strong relationships and verbal praise, but also through the use of a token economy system where they earn Mustang Bucks that can be utilized in our amazing and well stocked school store. We take care of any families in need through additional support that is provided should they need school uniforms, food items, or additional counseling services along with our VIP (Very Involved Parent) program designed to encourage parent participation. To top off our relationship building, mentoring and support, positive reinforcement, and social and emotional learning, our culture for learning is high and full of passion. Teacher and students live by the motto "Better Today than Yesterday", and that is surrounded by an amazing leadership team that encourages reflection and growth in a non-evaluative and non-threatening manner. Planning support, coaching cycles, modeling, data chats, and reflection lead to a growth mindset that makes everybody believe that we are better together than any one of us alone. To top this all off, our campus is an all inclusive mixture of culture, learning styles, talents, and interests. All of this is honored and promoted on a daily basis through our morning show, student services, alignment with academic goal setting, our Mindful Mustangs program, and our mentoring outreach which includes a program for girls called GEMS (list acronym here) and for our boys (GENTS...list acronym here). At Miles, staff and students have a home away from home!

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

Greta Woolley - Behavior resource - offers coaching cycles to teachers and staff on behavior management strategies and practices, also coordinates the House system for 5th grade, offers professional development on SEL
Kelly Rashford - Guidance Counselor- in charge of our PBIS program, conducts SEL lessons in classrooms
Debra Mora - Guidance Counselor - in charge of CST and coordinating the House system in 5th grade, offers professional development on the 7 Mindsets and runs our character education program
James Powell - Behavior para - specializes in de-escalating students to get them back into the learning environment as quickly as possible