

Manatee County Public Schools

# Jessie P. Miller Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 5/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>72%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>53%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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**

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
Riley, Debra	Principal	Principal of Miller Elementary
Deleo, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Potter, Katelyn	Dean	
Westendorf, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Watkins, Jodi	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 5/1/2020, Debra Riley

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

580

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

19

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

13

**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	96	103	92	113	101	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	37	45	39	40	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	2	16	9	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	30	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	25	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	13	9	7	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/6/2022

**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	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	

**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	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	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	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	51%	55%	56%				56%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						52%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						48%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	50%	50%				67%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						66%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						48%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	65%	59%				51%	48%	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	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	65%	4%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	53%	-3%
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	20	46	50	29	50	54	44				
ELL	38	65		38	50		30				
BLK	32	40		49	63	45	40				
HSP	44	58	45	48	57	38	50				
MUL	33	53		53	62						
WHT	63	53	29	78	72	67	75				
FRL	44	53	49	58	59	35	50				

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				

**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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

  

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	50
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	62
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	52
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?

Grade 3- 2022 FSA ELA data compared to 2019 FSA data shows a 10 percentage point decline. Math data from the same data points indicates a 1 percentage point increase.

Grade 4- 2022 FSA ELA data compared to 2019 FSA data shows a 13 percentage point decline. Math data from the same data points indicates a 16 percentage point decline.

Grade 5- 2022 FSA ELA data compared to 2019 FSA data shows a 12% point increase. Math data from the same data points indicates a 20 percentage point increase. Science data reflects a 12 percentage point increase.

Subgroup data reflects an increase in achievement percentage points for the following: BLK- ELA and Math; HSP- ELA; WHT- Math; FRL- Math.

Subgroup data reflects an increase in learning gains for the following: SWD- ELA (LG and LG L25), Math (LG L25); ELL- ELA (LG); BLK- ELA and Math; WHT- Math; FRL- ELA.

Subgroup data reflects a decrease in achievement for the following: SWD- ELA and Math; ELL- Math; WHT- ELA.

Overall, Math and Science continue to be a strength for our students at Miller.

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

ELA achievement is an area that needs to be improved in Grades 3 and 4 this year. These two grade levels data components showed the sharpest decline: 3rd- 10% decline, 4th- 13% decline. Furthermore, we need to strengthen the achievement levels of the following subgroups: SWD- ELA and Math, ELL- ELA and Math, HSP- Math, WHT- ELA, FRL- ELA.

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

We were a Universal RAISE school in 2021-2022 based off of our 3rd grade ELA performance. This same group of students, as 4th grade students last year, continued to score below 50% ELA achievement causing us to remain a Universal RAISE school this year. This year, as a district, we will be focusing on acceleration and increasing the amount of intervention students receive. We will be placing equal emphasis on all learners.

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

Our 5th Grade scores remain strong in ELA, Math and Science. However last year, the increases were tremendous improvements over the 2019 scores: ELA- up 12%, Math- up 20%, Science- up 20%. We know this group of 5th grade students has traditionally struggled on state assessments. We will closely monitor their progress on FAST and benchmark assessments throughout the year.

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

This improvement is attributed to strong hiring of qualified teachers. This group of teachers carefully planned using standards-based instruction. Students were provided interventions based on specific need in ELA and Math. Quarterly planning days allowed teachers to dig deep into the standards and plan specific lessons based on student need.

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

This year, our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teams will be implementing acceleration in ELA for students meeting the district determined criteria. Students who do not meet the criteria for acceleration will engage in deeper levels of remediation in an effort to accelerate their achievement.

Our 3rd and 4th grade students will have the opportunity for math acceleration based on district determined criteria. Students not meeting that criteria will participate in grade level mathematics instruction on a daily basis.

**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.**

Acceleration teachers have been provided professional development for ELA and Math prior to school starting. Those PD offerings are ongoing for teachers who did not take them over the summer. Acceleration teachers also have access to our instructional coach. Additionally, grade level teams will be provided quarterly planning days for 2nd, 3rd and 4th Quarters.

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

Last year, we saw an increase in several subgroups in math. We will continue Acaletics in grades 3-5 this year. Careful Acaletics data analysis will determine student groupings to promote the most growth possible in math.

**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 ELA**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our 3rd and 4th grade students show lower performance on ELA Achievement on the FSA. While our teachers are showing an increase in proficiency in identifying students who fall into the L25 subgroup, providing specific interventions based on student need, our achievement percentage in both grade levels has declined.

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

By May 2023, our 3rd-5th Grade students will increase their ELA achievement from 51% to 55% as measured by the FAST Assessment.

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

FAST PM1 and PM2 as well as the Quarter 2 District Benchmark Assessment will be used to determine progress toward our goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Data analysis of FAST PM1 and PM2.  
Data analysis of Q2 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.  
Quarterly Collaborative Planning will provide time for teachers to plan for the BEST Standards, and to incorporate the high yield strategies in daily student activities (summarizing, explicit vocabulary, and writing across content areas).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

Since this is the first year implementing FAST assessments, we are focusing specifically on achievement levels this year. The quarterly benchmark assessments have been used in the past to provide data that closely resembles accurate performance levels on the FSA, so we will continue to use that data to determine progress toward the goal as well. Our grade levels will also continue to use data gleaned from Next Step Reading Assessments to determine specific areas of need for all readers regardless of their reading levels. They will form small groups that address these needs and provide support to students.



**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**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.

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)

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. Grades 3-5 teachers will also be provided PD based on implementation of the new ELA BEST standards.

**Person Responsible** Jodi Watkins (watkinsj2@manateeschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

Identify students meeting district criteria for ELA Acceleration classes in grades 3-5. Students will utilize DBQ and Benchmark Advance Inquiry projects as a means to extend their reading and writing skills.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on 21-22 FSA data, our 4th grade students' math scores dropped 16 percentage points from the 2019 data point. When this group of students took the FSA in 3rd grade they scored 48% achievement. Their score last year was 53% which is a 4% increase. While we see an increase in this group, the progress is minimal.

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

By May 2023, our 3rd-5th Grade students will increase their Math achievement from 63% to 64% as measured by the FAST Assessment.

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

FAST PM1 and PM2 as well as the Quarter 2 District Benchmark Assessment will be used to determine progress toward our goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Data analysis of FAST PM1 and PM2.  
 Data analysis of Q2 benchmark assessments.  
 Data analysis of monthly Acaletics Scrimmages to group students for instruction based on mathematic ability.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Since this is the first year implementing FAST assessments, we are focusing specifically on achievement levels this year. The quarterly benchmark assessments have been used in the past to provide data that closely resembles accurate performance levels on the FSA, so we will continue to use that data to determine progress toward the goal as well. Our grade levels will also continue to use data gleaned from monthly Acaletics Scrimmages to determine specific areas of need for all learners regardless of their mathematic ability.

### 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.

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)

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)

Quarterly planning days provided beginning in Q2 for all grades K-5. Grades 3-5 teachers will also be provided PD based on implementation of the new Math BEST standards.

**Person Responsible** Jodi Watkins (watkinsj2@manateeschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

Identify students meeting district criteria for Math Acceleration classes in grades 3 and 4. Students will utilize enVision Acceleration curriculum to increase proficiency with all grade level math standards and specific standards of the following grade level.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our 5th Grade students have continued to increase their science achievement levels from 50% in 2019 to 62% in 2021. This high level of achievement is necessary for Miller Elementary to maintain a school grade of a B.

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

By May 2023, our 5th Grade students will increase their Science achievement from 62% to 63% as measured by the NGSS Assessment.

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

The Quarterly District Science Benchmark Assessment will be used to determine progress toward our goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Data analysis of quarterly benchmark assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The quarterly benchmark assessments have been used in the past to provide data that closely resembles accurate performance levels on the NGSS Science Assessment, so we will continue to use that data to determine progress toward the goal.

#### 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.

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)

Teachers will complete and submit a Progress Monitoring Data Sheet used to track student data across science assessments throughout the year.

**Person Responsible**

Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

Quarterly planning days provided beginning in Q2 for all grades K-5. Grades 4-5 teachers will utilize the WOZ materials to plan science lessons based on the standards tested. A focus for planning will be to utilize the high yield strategy of writing across content areas for all students.

**Person Responsible**

Jodi Watkins (watkinsj2@manateeschools.net)

Monitoring of weekly lesson plans to ensure that teachers are upholding standards based lesson plans created during quarterly planning days. Explicit academic language linked to the big ideas will also be planned for, and implemented in lessons.

**Person Responsible**

Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.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

Data Review: End of year iReady diagnostic data for K-2 students indicate that 61% of our students are on track to score at a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment (FAST) at the end of the school year. Students in Grades K-2 were also required to track running record assessment data. Based on this data at the end of the 21-22 school year, 64% of students in Kindergarten were Meeting/Exceeding grade level expectations for reading. 54% of Grade 1 students and 56% of Grade 2 students were meeting/exceeding expectations for reading. Reading Achievement for students in K-2 was 58%.

Area of Focus: K-2 will continue to focus on need specific small group instruction during the 90 minute ELA block. They will also focus on providing interventions to Tier 2/3 students based on diagnostic data, running records, FAST data and classroom observations.

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

Data Review: Miller Elementary 21-22 ELA Proficiency in ELA was 51%, down 3 percentage points from the 20-21 school year data. The grade level totals were as follows: Grade 3- 50%, Grade 4- 41%, Grade 5-62%. Grade 4 students scored below 50% proficiency which results in Miller being added to the Universal RAISE school list in the state of Florida. In 2021, our current 3rd grade students scored at 45% in ELA. This same group of students who were 4th grade students last year dropped to 41% proficient in ELA on the FSA assessment.

Area of Focus: Knowing that this year's 5th grade students have scored historically lower than other grade levels over the past two years, those teachers must follow our assessment matrix and assess reading levels across the year. Based on data from running records, students must be grouped according to specific needs. Interventions for Tier 2/3 students based on running records, FAST PM1/

PM2 data, quarterly benchmark data and classroom observations must be research based and specific to each student's need.

**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)**

By May 2023, K-2 students will increase their ELA proficiency from 58% to 60% as measured by the FAST assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By May 2023, 3-5 students will increase their ELA proficiency from 51% to 55% as measured by the FAST assessment. Specifically, Grade 5 students will increase their proficiency from 41% to 50% by PM3 of the FAST assessment.

**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 data from PM1 and PM2 of the ELA FAST assessment in K-5 as one progress monitoring tool. We will also use K-2 running record data entered into SchoolCity to monitor progress. Additionally, we will look closely at the Q2 benchmark assessment data for students in Grades 3-5 as this has provided us with data that closely mirrors end of year statewide assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Riley, Debra, rileyd@manateeschools.net

**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?

K-5 teachers will use the core reading program, Benchmark Advance, as their primary tool for ELA instruction since it is aligned to the BEST standards. K-5 teachers will also use the Manatee County Decision Tree as a tool to help define Tier 1, 2, and 3 students. Students who meet criteria for Tier 2/3 will be remediated using any of the following programs supported by the district: Literacy Footprints, Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2/3 lessons, iReady Tools for Instruction lessons, and/or Imagine learning (for ELL students). All of these resources align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and are aligned to the BEST 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?

Data analysis of benchmark assessments for last year's Grade 4 students suggest that our current 5th Grade readers are lacking in vocabulary and comprehension. Our intention is for teachers to plan and implement a purposeful instruction for Tier 1 to meet the needs of individual readers. Grade levels will implement instructional routines focusing on comprehension/vocabulary grade level instruction including: Interactive read alouds, shared reading, close reading, and explicit vocabulary instruction.

**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
<p>Provide quarterly planning days, led by the Instructional Coach, to each grade level focusing on all subject areas. For ELA, teachers and the instructional coach will understand the BEST standards and plan specifically how to teach those standards using a variety of instructional materials. Teachers will determine the assessment tools needed to progress monitor student's grasp of the standards. During the planning days, PD will be embedded within the planning on understanding the BEST standards.</p>	<p>Watkins, Jodi, watkinsj2@manateeschools.net</p>
<p>Hold monthly grade level TCT's to monitor student progress and identify students needing Tier 2/3 supports. Implement the Decision-Trees from the Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan for reading intervention instruction.</p>	<p>Morris, Amy, morris3a@manateeschools.net</p>
<p>AP and Instructional Coach will attend all professional learning opportunities listed on the RAISE Professional Learning Plan for 2022-2023. Teachers will be encouraged to attend the various courses offered via RAISE.</p>	<p>Deleo, Kimberly, deleok@manateeschools.net</p>

### 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.

1. SAC/PTO comprised of teachers, administrators, staff members, parents and community members meet four times per year 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 send 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.
8. Schoolwide training/implementation of CHAMPS.

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



Teachers- establish classroom expectations/routines for behavior and learning. They communicate this to parents along with individual student progress. This year all staff has been trained to implement CHAMPS. CHAMPS expectations are taught and reinforced daily in and out of the classroom.

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.