Plano Independent School District

Miller Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:35 PM

Mission Statement

The mission of the Miller Elementary Community is to provide opportunities for every student to be actively engaged in learning and strive to be motivated life-long learners. Our teachers are committed to assessing individual needs and providing interventions in order to build a strong educational foundation.

Vision

Committed to Excellence, Dedicated to Caring, Powered by Learning, Plano ISD Proud.

Value Statement

Plano ISD Beliefs

ALL students are at the heart of our decisions.
High expectations lead to growth and achievement for each student and staff member.
Graduates must possess the skills and knowledge that prepare them to become responsible citizens and successful leaders.
All students will utilize social, emotional and academic skills in order to become resilient and resourceful lifelong learners.
The highest levels of learning occur when students are engaged in work that is relevant, authentic and challenging.
Equity and access to equal opportunities are essential to reaching the highest levels of student achievement.
As good stewards, we provide access to resources that enable each student to reach his/her aspirations.
Our diverse, innovative and future-focused employees are the most valuable resource vital to the growth, care and success of each student.
We embrace families, staff, students and our community in the shared responsibility of educating our children.
Developing meaningful, collaborative relationships in a welcoming, safe and caring environment is essential for student success.
Quality public education is the foundation of a thriving community.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 9

Perceptions 11

Priority Problem Statements 13

Data Documentation for CNA 15

Improvement Planning Data 16

Accountability Data 16

Student Data: Assessments 16

Student Data: Student Groups 16

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 17

Employee Data 17

Parent/Community Data 18

Priorities 19

Priority 1 : 1.1 20

Priority 2 : 2.1 26

Priority 3 : 4.2 29

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Miller serves a diverse and evolving student population of about 328 students, with enrollment declining over time while the percentages of students identified as Emergent Bilingual, economically disadvantaged, at risk, receiving special education services, or identified with dyslexia have increased. More than one-fifth of students are Emergent Bilingual, highlighting the importance of language-development supports, sheltered instruction, and family communication in multiple languages. Increases in economically disadvantaged and at-risk student populations underscore the need for equitable access to resources, targeted interventions, and strong MTSS processes. Special education services represent one of the campus's largest student groups, requiring ongoing collaboration, inclusive practices, and careful monitoring of student progress. The campus also serves significant populations of students with dyslexia, Gifted and Talented students, military-connected students, and immigrant students, each requiring specialized supports and opportunities. Although attendance remains a strength at 95.9%, chronic absenteeism has increased and should continue to be addressed through proactive family engagement and support. Overall, the report emphasizes the need for strong Tier I instruction, equitable access, data-driven decision-making, collaborative support systems, and strategic resource alignment to ensure academic growth and belonging for every student.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Overall, Miller Elementary demonstrated strong student growth across multiple grade levels, particularly in mathematics. Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, and Grade 5 exceeded district performance in math, with 62%, 63%, 76%, and 68% of students, respectively, surpassing their projected growth targets. Grade 2 showed the strongest math performance, with over three-fourths of students exceeding expected growth. Science results were also a notable strength, with Grades 3 and 4 outperforming district averages as 66% and 59% of students exceeded projected growth. Reading performance was more varied across grade levels. Kindergarten and Grade 3 slightly outperformed district averages in the percentage of students exceeding projected growth, while Grades 1, 2, 4, and especially Grade 5 showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.

Overall, the data indicate that Miller Elementary's instructional practices are producing exceptional gains in mathematics and solid growth in science, while reading achievement remains an area for continued focus and targeted intervention, particularly in the upper elementary grades.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Reading performance was more varied across grade levels and showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.	Miller does not consistently implement and vertically align expectations. Diagnostic and student-work data are not always used consistently across teams.
2 ★	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.
3 ★	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Miller Elementary has established comprehensive processes for curriculum implementation, collaborative planning, data analysis, professional learning, communication, technology integration, behavior support, and academic intervention. Strong mathematics and science growth provide evidence that these systems can positively affect student outcomes.

However, upper-elementary reading growth, writing achievement, early-literacy needs, student-group gaps, and the high percentage of students with active SSPs indicate that implementation is not yet equally effective across all programs and classrooms. Campus improvement efforts should focus on strengthening Tier I literacy instruction, refining intervention and progress-monitoring practices, protecting instructional time, increasing collaboration among service providers, and monitoring whether professional learning and campus initiatives are implemented with fidelity and produce measurable improvements in student achievement.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.
2	Thirty-four percent of Miller students have active SSPs, and current intervention and progress-monitoring systems are not consistently producing sufficient acceleration for all students.	The high number of active plans and smaller teams limits the campus's ability to deliver and monitor every intervention with the frequency and intensity required to accelerate student learning.
3 ★	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.
4 ★	Reading performance was more varied across grade levels and showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.	Miller does not consistently implement and vertically align expectations. Diagnostic and student-work data are not always used consistently across teams.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Recent survey results indicate very positive perceptions across several key areas of our school. Families consistently recognize our strong partnership with parents and the PTA, highlighting the collaborative environment that supports student success.

- **School Climate and Safety:** Parents and students report feeling safe, welcomed, and respected at school. The school is viewed as a caring community where positive relationships and student well-being are prioritized.

- **Instructional Quality:** Survey responses reflect confidence in the high-quality instruction provided by teachers. Families appreciate the dedication of staff, rigorous learning experiences, and the support offered to help students meet their academic goals.

- **Student Engagement:** Results suggest that students are actively engaged in their learning and participate enthusiastically in classroom and school activities. Students feel connected to their school and are motivated to succeed. Families also appreciate the variety of **parent engagement and family fun nights**, which provide opportunities for parents to be actively involved in their children's education while strengthening connections between home and school.

- **Communication and Responsiveness:** One of the strongest themes from the survey is the school's commitment to maintaining open communication with families. Parents value the school's responsiveness, regular updates, and the strong involvement of the PTA, which helps create a true partnership between home and school.

Overall, the survey results reflect a school community that works hand-in-hand with parents and the PTA, fostering a safe, supportive, and engaging environment where students and families feel connected, valued, and empowered to succeed.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Balancing parent input with campus priorities to ensure that all stakeholder voices are heard while maintaining focus on instructional goals.	Misperceptions and misinformation shared through social media continues to impact the school.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Reading performance was more varied across grade levels and showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.	Miller does not consistently implement and vertically align expectations. Diagnostic and student-work data are not always used consistently across teams.
2 ★	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.
3 ★	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.

★ = Priority

Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

The following data were used to verify the comprehensive needs assessment analysis:

Improvement Planning Data

- [x] **District goals**
- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [x] **State and federal planning requirements**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Student failure and/or retention rates**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**
- [x] **Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**
- [x] **Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**
- [x] **Intervention data**

Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups**
- [x] **Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group**
- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Gifted and talented data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Class size averages by grade and subject**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data**
- [x] **Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact**

- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **Staff mobility/stability**
- [x] **Support structures: mentors**
- [x] **Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data**
- [x] **Classroom and school walkthrough data**

Parent/Community Data

- [x] **Parent surveys and/or other feedback**

Priorities

Priority 1 1.1

Goal 1

Improve reading achievement and growth for students in grades 3-5.

Performance Target: The percentage of students at achieving Meets or above on STAAR RLA will increase to at least 60%, and each grade level will achieve 100% of projected MAP reading growth.

Expected Result: Students will demonstrate increased reading achievement and academic growth through strong Tier 1 instruction, targeted intervention, and ongoing progress monitoring.

Strategy 1

Use a consistent PLC cycle

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLC team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Strengthen writing across the curriculum

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Deliver targeted literacy intervention

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Provide intentional extension for advanced learners

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers & PLC team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Identify students in the Asian subgroup not meeting projected growth, and provide targeted small-group instruction, enrichment, and progress monitoring based on individual student needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers & PLC team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance was more varied across grade levels and showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.	Miller does not consistently implement and vertically align expectations. Diagnostic and student-work data are not always used consistently across teams.
2	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.
4	Reading performance was more varied across grade levels and showed opportunities for improvement, with a larger percentage of students meeting or falling below expected growth.	Miller does not consistently implement and vertically align expectations. Diagnostic and student-work data are not always used consistently across teams.

Goal 2

Improve student achievement in 3rd - 5th grade math.

Performance Target: The percentage of students achieving Meets or above on STAAR Math will increase from 48% to at least 55%, and each grade level will achieve 100% of projected MAP mathematics growth.

Expected Result: Student achievement in 5th grade math will improve through stronger Tier 1 instruction and targeted intervention.

Strategy 1

Use a consistent PLC cycle

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLC team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Use data to provide flexible small-group instruction

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Tuesday collaborative planning team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Quick spiral review

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Targeted intervention

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Provide intentional extension for advanced learners

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Collaborative Team Planning Team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Identify students in the Asian subgroup not meeting projected growth, and provide targeted small-group instruction, enrichment, and progress monitoring based on individual student needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers & PLC team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Priority 2 2.1

Goal 1

Increase academic growth and advanced learning opportunities for Quintile 1 students.

Performance Target: 100% of quintile one students will receive documented opportunities for depth, complexity, creativity, and advanced problem-solving. At least 80% of quintile one students will meet or exceed their individual MAP growth projections.

Expected Result: Quintile 1 students will consistently engage in advanced learning experiences that promote depth, complexity, creativity, and problem-solving, resulting in strong individual academic growth.

Strategy 1

Document GT Differentiation

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLC team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Provide Professional Learning

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Monitor Student Growth

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLC team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Students receiving special education services, students identified as at risk, economically disadvantaged students, and Emergent Bilingual students perform below overall campus rates in both reading and mathematics. The greatest differences are evident at the Meets and Masters levels.	Rigorous grade-level instruction is not yet consistently paired with the planned scaffolds, academic-language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction. Collaboration and progress monitoring among general ed, SPED, and EB vary across grade level.

Priority 3 4.2

Goal 1

Improve and maintain strong student attendance at Miller Elementary.

Performance Target: Miller Elementary will maintain an average daily attendance rate of at least 96%

Expected Result: Student attendance will remain consistently high through proactive monitoring, family communication, and targeted support for students with attendance concerns.

Strategy 1

Monthly attendance data reviews

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Upper Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Use a tiered attendance-support system, including SSPs

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Upper Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Recognize attendance improvement and consistency

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Upper Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.

Goal 2

Strengthen consistent, positive student behavior across Miller Elementary.

Performance Target: Miller Elementary will implement common campus-wide PBIS expectations and behavior-response procedures with at least 90% fidelity.

Expected Result: Staff will consistently use common campus-wide PBIS expectations and behavior-response procedures to create a safe, predictable, and supportive learning environment.

Strategy 1

Define and teach/reteach campus-wide behavior expectations - PBIS and Code of Civility

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: all staff

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November **February** **June**

Strategy 2

Implement a consistent positive-reinforcement system

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: all staff

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November **February** **June**

Strategy 3

Monitor PBIS implementation through walkthroughs and coaching

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: upper leadership

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November **February** **June**

Strategy 4

Consistently teach CARE lessons

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Miller does not yet have consistent campuswide implementation and monitoring of Tier 1 PBIS expectations, classroom-management practices, and tiered behavior supports. The campus has 15 active behavior SSP goals, and differences in how staff teach expectations, reinforce positive behavior, use the Leveled Behavior Guide, document incidents, and respond to behavior impact student progress.	Campuswide expectations for PBIS, classroom management, use of the Leveled Behavior Guide, and behavior documentation are not yet consistently defined, communicated, and implemented across all classrooms and common areas.