Manatee County Public Schools

Palm View K 8 School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 17

Budget to Support Goals 19

Palm View K 8 School

6025 BAYSHORE RD, Palmetto, FL 34221

https://www.manateeschools.net/palmview

Demographics

Principal: Kaththea Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: F (31%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 17

Budget to Support Goals 19

Palm View K 8 School

6025 BAYSHORE RD, Palmetto, FL 34221

https://www.manateeschools.net/palmview

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	D	D	C

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 Palm View Elementary is to provide an educational environment that enables students to develop to their fullest potential through the cooperative effort of the total school community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palm View School's faculty and staff are committed to providing students exemplary instruction that nurtures intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, and a passion for learning. We will work collaboratively to prepare our students for success to graduate from high school on schedule, with the skills and knowledge required for success in higher education and/or the work place.

Our vision is that every child will reach grade-level proficiency in reading, writing, mathematics and science. We will work to insure that everyone in our school rallies around this vision; that everyone in the school can share how we are working on our goals together; and that all of us are focused on mutual growth and improvement.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Kaththea	Principal	
Dougherty, James	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	51	59	69	61	51	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	6	4	6	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	20	19	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	0	2	0	5	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	9	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	5	4	4	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	12	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	9	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	9	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	5	4	4	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	12	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	9	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	58%	61%	29%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	57%	59%	42%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	92%	52%	54%	45%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	54%	64%	62%	33%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	59%	48%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	55%	52%	48%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	54%	56%	26%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	76%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	74 (0)	51 (0)	59 (0)	69 (0)	61 (0)	51 (0)	124 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	489 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (17)	5 (15)	6 (9)	4 (11)	6 (6)	8 (3)	6 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (61)
One or more suspensions	1 (5)	0 (4)	2 (4)	0 (5)	2 (5)	4 (8)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (31)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (12)	0 (10)	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (28)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (39)	20 (27)	19 (32)	61 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	105 (98)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
	2018	25%	49%	-24%	57%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	56%	-14%	58%	-16%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	31%	52%	-21%	56%	-25%
	2018	18%	52%	-34%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	65%	-14%	64%	-13%
	2018	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	53%	60%	-7%	60%	-7%
	2018	35%	58%	-23%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
	2018	26%	49%	-23%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

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	8	79		29	89	93					
ELL	28	63	82	50	72	85	24				
BLK	26	68		40	64		8				
HSP	32	63	87	51	71	82	33				
WHT	68	78		71	68		69				
FRL	36	67	90	50	70	75	29				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	33	38	19	46	38	14				
ELL	13	37	38	34	57	36	7				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	22	35		30	50		17				
HSP	24	46	38	48	67	38	30				
WHT	38	36		48	64						
FRL	25	39	32	42	61	40	25				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	14	27	8	29	40	10				
ELL	13	40		21	43	33	7				
BLK	25	42	50	28	54		21				
HSP	29	48	55	34	46	50	23				
WHT	34	25		36	43		42				
FRL	26	41	48	29	42	43	17				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

5th Grade Science at37% Proficiency. While we did not achieve our goal for overall proficiency in the 5th grade Science assessment (50%), we did increase our percentage from 25% to 37%. We are choosing to maintain our initial goal for at least 50% proficiency. In addition to maintaining what was implemented last year, we plan to incorporate a deeper understanding and application of rigorous assignments/assessments through the Learning Focused Framework. We also plan to continue to support a K-6 level of understanding of the Science standards and progression. We will support this through collaborative planning.

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

No areas declined in the 18-19 school year.

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.

There are only two areas where we have a negative gap from the state: ELA Proficiency and Science Proficiency. ELA proficiency is 41% which is a 16 point gap from the State and Science proficiency is 37% which is a 16 point gap from the State. While both areas increased significantly from the prior year (ELA +14; Science +12), we are still not even or above the state level of performance. Being a Title I school and having a large number of students with significant Literacy gaps, this poses an area to continue to target and seek learning gains. We will continue to focus on increasing learning gains to ultimately close the proficiency gap with our students which will ultimately close the gap between how our students perform as compared to their peers across the State. We will do this through small group instruction, analysis of data and use to drive instruction, along with a continued emphasis on standards-based planning and instruction. In addition to maintaining what was implemented last year, we plan to incorporate a deeper understanding and application of rigorous assignments/assessments through the Learning Focused Framework. We will support this through collaborative planning.

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

Our largest improvement was in the area of Bottom Quartile Learning Gains for ELA (92%; +54 points). New actions taken are reflected as strategies in our 18-19 SIP: Standards based collaborative planning and instruction; fidelity to the district’s instructional programs through the use of the master schedule, professional development, and feedback; data driven planning and instruction through the use of TLCs and collaborative planning; and targeted, standards-based, differentiated, grade level small group instruction with additional support pushed into ELA blocks from January to May. The use of other content areas to include Science, Social Studies, and Writing were integrated into the ELA block along with best practices and strategies from the Learning Focused model.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

A potential area of concern are our 6th grade students who are level 1 on the 18-19 statewide assessments (FSA ELA and FSA Math). 61 out of our 124 total 6th graders scored a level 1 on either

the FSA ELA and/or the FSA Math. This is an area of focus as we review our current programs/ instructional groupings offered to ensure we make adequate learning gains in addition to closing the gap on student proficiency.

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

1. Science Proficiency
2. Standards-based planning in ELA, Math, and Science; integration of Writing in all content areas
3. Small Group Instruction – targeted, differentiated, grade level
4. Data Response: Learning gains: Overall and L25 in 3rd-6th

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA and Math
Rationale	We will improve student achievement by continuing to focus and support standards-based planning, highly effective instructional delivery, and fidelity to District instructional programs, required curriculum documents and data-driven decision making.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	(1) Grades 3-6 overall learning gains in ELA and Math will increase to at least 75%. (2) Grades 3-6 overall bottom quartile learning gains in ELA and Math will increase to at least 80%. (3) Grades 3-6 Student proficiency in ELA will increase to at least 50%. (4) Grades 3-6 Student proficiency in Math will increase to at least 60% (5) Grades 3-6 Student proficiency in 5th grade Science will increase to at least 50%. ...as measured by the 2019-2020 Florida Standards Assessments in grades 3-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Based Planning focused on both ELA and Math accomplished through weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade level teams and a member of the Leadership Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In a standards-based learning classroom student are expected to meet a defined measure of proficiency that is equivalent to the rigor of that grade level standard. Students must demonstrate evidence of this learning and how it reflects the grade level standard. It is up to the classroom teacher to scaffold student learning to help students achieve the highest levels of cognitive complexity. Research for standards-based learning comes from Marzano and his Essentials for Achieving Rigor Model (Moore, Toth & Marzano, 2017). This model is often described in the research as a road map for rigor. The philosophy behind is that, “if we have expectations in the real world for student learning that is rigorous, independent and applicable in the real world, teachers need to be able to plan instruction that will help students meet those goals” (Moore, Toth & Marzano, 2017).
Action Step	
Description	1. Assign Leadership Team Members to grade levels and specific weekly meeting times. 3. Using the "Palm View Planning Process" begin by following required district pacing guide and curriculum maps. 4. Unpack priority standards and determine LEQ's. 5. Plan formative assessments. 6. Plan lessons and activities. 7. Review data from formative and plan next steps.
Person Responsible	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Science
Rationale	We will improve Science achievement by implementing a K-6 Science plan to include an emphasis on integration during the ELA block as well as robust vocabulary instruction.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency on the 2019-2020 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Assessment for 5th grade Science will increase from 37% to at least 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Robust Vocabulary Instruction in Science where teachers will teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy was selected based on student data indicating that students at Palm View consistently struggle with vocabulary. Data from 5th grade on the 2018-2019 revealed 61% proficiency in vocabulary at Palm View as opposed to the district average of 66%. There is a direct link between vocabulary and reading comprehension (Marzano & Tickering, 2005). Further information from Marzano and Tickering (2005) purports,"One of the key indicators of students' success in school, on standardized tests, and indeed, in life, is their vocabulary. The reason for this is simply that the knowledge anyone has about a topic is based on the vocabulary of that information (p.5). This lack of vocabulary knowledge could be contributing to Palm View students struggling in Science.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers in grades 3-5 will receive Professional Development on Vocabulary strategies to support Science Content from Dr. Fradley. This instruction will consist of teaching classroom teachers how to incorporate robust vocabulary instruction of science content words into the ELA block when teaching Information Reading Units. 2. Ongoing support for instruction will be conducted during collaborative planning sessions with teachers throughout the year utilizing district Science ELA and Science Fusion Lessons in planning. 4. Utilize vocabulary cards provided by district and have teachers create Frayer Models on focused words. 5. Formative assessments will be implemented and utilized to make instructional decisions and to monitor the progress of student mastery of Science standards.
Person Responsible	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The PFEP attached addresses how Palm View will build positive relationships
with all stakeholders.
We plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by holding monthly Student Advisory Council (SAC) Meetings, distributing monthly calendars with school events, providing Parent University Workshops, weekly Principal communication via ConnectED, and teacher communication. In addition, we hold various evening events to foster a foundation for family and communal engagement.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

We ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing support through our guidance counselor and school psychologist. This is done by daily check-in and check-outs, in addition to a daily “lunch bunch” that focuses on a specific social skill. We also offer individualized programs such as: Centerstone for individual counseling, our Social Worker visits weekly to facilitate guidance in specific behavioral skills.

Our Graduation Enhancement Tech (GET) and Parent Liaison focus on student attendance, complete home visits, and provide individualized support. Also, our Student Support Specialist (SSS) also councils’ students daily.

Our Administrative Team closely monitors assessment data and behavior for all students, to ensure we are meeting the needs of all students.

We have implanted a school wide PBIS program which gives students incentives for positive behavior, facilitates interventions, and provides support. Furthermore, we provide anti-bullying through district support.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Working collaboratively with the School Advisory Council, the School Leadership Team, and the Instructional Leadership Team, the Principal conducts a series of needs assessments each year. Teachers are surveyed about their individual level of skills and knowledge in targeted areas (for example, Comprehension Instructional Sequence Model, Number Talks, student-centered math approaches, Leveled Literacy Instruction, text-based writing, the inquiry approach to teaching science, etc.), which helps drive our school improvement plan, professional development plan, and Title I budgeting process. We also survey parents about topics they would like to learn more about during parent involvement nights (such as how to help your child with math homework).

The priorities of our School Improvement Plan, which are based on district priorities and initiatives, and

teachers' highest learning needs that are required for our school to meet the district priorities and initiatives and our SIP goals, drive the Title I PD budget. Most of Palm View's professional development is funded through Title I and the Hope Grant.

The district provides the majority of the instructional resources that teachers need in order to implement the curriculum effectively, including the programs and materials required for extended day.

The Title I Reading Coach maintains an inventory of resources that teachers can use in the classroom with their students, as well as resources for teachers' own professional development. The instructional coach collaborates with teachers about school data and provides job-embedded professional development based on each individual teacher's needs. The instructional coach also offers workshops, book study groups, and other in-service activities based on teachers' and students' needs, which are conducted before school, during planning periods, and after school. An entire classroom is reserved as a science lab to house a large array of science resources.

The Media Specialist maintains the inventory of all textbooks and supplemental materials.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Instructional Leadership Team is formed of various staff members who lead smaller teams such as TLCs, MTSS/IST, Grade Level Teams, PBIS, etc. This team analyzes state, district, and school assessments and data that reflect the academic, social, and emotional needs of the students. Data that is also included in this analysis process is Parent Involvement data, the Title I Needs Assessment, and surveys that document input from all stakeholders. This team then proceeds through the problem solving process. This process forces all stakeholders to look deeper and examine all the surrounding factors that may not be considered. From there, it is presented to various stakeholders to gather input. An additional team added last school year and this year is our Hope Grant Committee, which is made up of members of the ILT, teachers, parents, and community members. Together and with the input of families, Parent Universities and other family workshops are planned and facilitated over the course of the school year and are focused around student/family interests.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

School utilizes ePIE to form partnerships with local business and community organizations (such as Kona Ice, Culvers) along with 21st Century schools and various surrounding Churches. Palm View is also partners with United Way on a mission called 'The Big Plan' which will include added supports such as Reading and Learning Pals, after school tutoring, and parent/family nights.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ELA and Math**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science**	**$0.00**

Total:	**$0.00**