Miles Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Miles Elementary School

317 E 124TH AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nolan, Carla	Principal	Monitor the fidelity of the plan and engage stakeholders and instructional leaders in the monitoring and implementation of the plan, making adjustments as needed.
Wilcox, Rotunda	Assistant Principal	To support the Principal in the monitoring of the fidelity of the plan and engage stakeholders and instructional leaders in the monitoring and implementation of the plan, making adjustments as needed.

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

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

The School Advisory Council leader will serve as the liaison between the school leadership team and the SAC. School data and feedback will be presented at each monthly SAC meeting.

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

After each semester, the school leadership team will review the achievement data and revise the SIP as necessary.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	49	48	54	41	33	0	0	0	225
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	5	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	66	41	0	0	0	0	107
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	53	38	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	48	36	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	44	40	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	13	34	23	0	0	0	74

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	50	43	59	33	46	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	52	51	55	0	0	0	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	166

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	15	14	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	50	43	59	33	46	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	68	36	0	0	0	0	104
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	46	36	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	52	51	55	0	0	0	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	72	28	66	0	0	0	166

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	15	14	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	16	2	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement*	24	50	53	26	53	56	22		
ELA Learning Gains				60			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			46		
Math Achievement*	37	56	59	38	50	50	25		
Math Learning Gains				64			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	20	50	54	22	59	59	17		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	44	59	59	60			66		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	142
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	11	Yes	4	1
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	19	Yes	4	1
HSP	29	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	26	Yes	1	1
FRL	29	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	48			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	46			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	24			37			20					44
SWD	4			19			7				5	23
ELL	26			46			22				5	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			31			12				4	
HSP	23			39			19				5	43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			41			20				4	
FRL	24			38			18				5	47

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	26	60	56	38	64	44	22					60
SWD	8	42	45	17	51	28	7					55
ELL	27	64	53	47	71	46	20					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16	58	67	22	57	46	14					
HSP	27	60	52	46	70	46	24					58
MUL	42	40		33	60							
PAC												
WHT	45	67		39	39							
FRL	25	60	56	37	64	44	21					60

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	22	39	46	25	53	36	17					66
SWD	6	25	42	15	33	17	0					64
ELL	25	38	55	29	58	31	17					66

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13	29		16	26		5					
HSP	23	41	62	28	63	43	20					66
MUL	29			21								
PAC												
WHT	37	60		41								
FRL	21	39	48	26	53	38	17					66

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	54%	-27%	58%	-31%
03	2023 - Spring	16%	46%	-30%	50%	-34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	59%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	17%	47%	-30%	51%	-34%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Science achievement data was the lowest cell, it has continuously been our lowest performing cell and that could be because we have more support in other subject areas (i.e. reading and math coaches and interventionists).

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

Science achievement data. We went from having a science only teacher the year before to departmentalizing math and science across the grade levels.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA achievement has the greatest gap. The factors that contribute to this are our high ELL population that come to us as monolingual students. In addition, we have many students from poverty that lack the foundational skills needed to read and comprehend text.

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

Math proficiency showed the most improvement, we focused on small group interventions and coaching cycles more than we had in previous years.

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

Attendance and Course failure in reading and math

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

Reading Gains
Math Gains
Science Proficiency
Attendance
Behavior

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Students with one of more suspensions in intermediate grades was higher than primary grades and those numbers often correlate with level one achievement on standardized tests.

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

We will decrease the number of out-of-school suspensions by 20% this year.

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

Our Behavior Resource teacher will be tracking students using Behavior Tracking and referrals and proactively
use restorative circles with students and coaching cycles with teachers to address the needs of the students before they reach the point of suspension.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Restorative circles and teacher coaching cycles to ensure that the students feel safe and that the teachers are using appropriate behavior techniques.

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

There are many new teachers on our campus who would benefit from coaching in behavior strategies.
Also, we have a high percentage of students in poverty that come to us with trauma and would benefit from trauma-informed strategies and interventions.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Since our school is below the state average in all areas of proficiency, we need to focus on ensuring that we are teaching to the rigor of the benchmarks in whole-group and small-group so that we can close the achievement gap and get more students to proficiency.

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

Increase reading proficiency to 33%, math proficiency to 43% and science proficiency to 25% on state tests.

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

Our school-level academic coaches will plan with grade-level teams and use coaching cycles to improve implementation of planning while the administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide feedback to improve teaching practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carla Nolan (carla.nolan@hcps.net)

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

We will be implementing teaching the science of reading to all students in kindergarten through second grade and identified students in 3rd - 5th grade to help close the achievement gap and improve reading proficiency schoolwide.

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

Research has shown that direct instruction in the science of reading has improved students' reading abilities drastically. Once students can read and comprehend the text this will positively impact all tested subjects.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Miles will use our funding to hire academic interventionist to work with students who need more support in the fundamentals of mathematics and the science of reading. In addition, we will hire reading, writing, and math coaches to increase teacher capacity in planning to the rigor of the benchmark. We will also hire a behavior resource teacher and extra guidance counselor to focus on proactively addressing student misbehavior and assisting with improving student attendance.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The area of focus specifically relating to ELA for Kindergarten through 2nd grade is phonics and foundational skills. Students must develop proficiency with these skills to help them to read and comprehend texts. According to the Spring 2023 assessment data for Miles Elementary, 59% of kindergarteners, 87% of 1st graders, and 58% of 2nd graders, scored below the 40th percentile on either the STAR Early Literacy test or the STAR Reading test.

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

The area of focus specifically relating to ELA for 3rd grade through 5th grade is foundational skills and comprehension. According to the Spring 2023 assessment data for Miles Elementary, 84% of 3rd graders, 75% of 4th graders, and 67% of 5th graders scored below level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

On the 2024 Spring assessment students scoring below the 40th percentile on either the STAR Early Literacy test or the STAR Reading test in Kindergarten will decrease from 59% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 45%, in 1st grade will decrease from 87% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 50%, and in 2nd grade 58% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 45%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

On the 2024 Spring assessment scoring below level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment in 3rd grade will decrease from 75% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 60%, in 4th grade will decrease from 75% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 60%, and in 5th grade from 67% scored on the Spring 2023 PM3 assessment to 50%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The school's Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through DIBELS, UFLI, iReady Reading Diagnostics, Wonders Spotlights, classroom-teacher checks for understanding, and FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments. Data and evidence collected from the ongoing monitoring will provide a gauge for learner understanding and progress toward proficiency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nolan, Carla, carla.nolan@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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-3rd: UFLI Foundations for whole group instruction, resource for small group Tier 2/3 intervention, Flamingo structure for small group instruction. Assessment UFLI weekly to monitor Tier 2, DIBELS progress monitoring biweekly and monitor Tier 3. Wonders curriculum to monitor comprehension.
4th grade: UFLI Foundations for whole group instruction, resource for small group Tier 2/3 intervention, Flamingo structure for small group instruction. Assessment UFLI weekly to monitor Tier 2, DIBELS progress monitoring biweekly and monitor Tier 3. Wonders curriculum to monitor comprehension.
5th grade: UFLI Foundations as needed as small group instruction for Tier 2/3 intervention. Assessment UFLI to monitor Tier 2, DIBELS progress monitoring biweekly and monitor Tier 3. Wonders curriculum to monitor comprehension.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

UFLI Foundations is research-based and evidence-based program used for instruction in foundational reading skills to promote the development of each of the key elements needed to proficiently read words in connected text.
STAR Renaissance is a comprehensive assessment that provides insights needed to guide literacy growth for emergent readers, struggling readers, and high achievers.
DIBELS is used for assessing the acquisition of literacy skills and monitor the development of early literacy and early reading skills in kindergarten through eighth grade.
iReady a valid and reliable adaptive K–12 diagnostic, individualized K–8 student online instruction and teacher-led 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
The Miles Leadership Team will conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of Checks for Understanding during the literacy block. Literacy Leadership: Schedule and conduct walkthroughs with the Administrators. Literacy Coaching: Monitoring for fidelity with walk-throughs and providing feedback. Modeling and co-teaching lessons. Provide resources for literacy instruction. K-5 Teachers participate in weekly PLCs and ELA planning meetings with coaches. Assessment: Use weekly UFLI assessments. Use of checks for understanding. Professional Learning: K-5 Teachers participate in weekly PLCs.	Wilcox, Rotunda, rotunda.wilcox@hcps.net
Literacy Coaches will meet with K-5 teachers for PLCs and planning to analyze ELA data and plan instructional lessons based on the evidence from the data. Literacy Leadership: Plan and implement PLCs with teachers based on instructional needs. Literacy Coaching: Literacy Coaches will utilize coaching cycles with K-5 teachers to improve literacy instruction. Assessment: Coaches will meet with K-5 teachers for weekly PLCs review and analyze data from exit tickets, mini assessments, wonders spotlights, and other assessments. Professional Learning: Literacy coaches will meet with K-5 teachers as needed for training on current literacy curriculum.	Wilcox, Rotunda, rotunda.wilcox@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Dissemination of this SIP and SWP will take place at faculty and SAC meetings along with uploads on our website so that all stakeholders will have access to the information and be able to attend meetings to discuss it in person.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

At Miles, we have multiple parent involvement nights throughout the year relating to different monthly celebrations, curriculum and subject-area topics, and parent-teacher conference nights. This is in addition to SAC and PTA meetings throughout the year. We are building upon our trusting relationship between the school and community each year.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We are using coaches and interventionist throughout the school day to maximize instructional time and help to close the achievement gap as efficiently and effectively as possible.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No