Palm Avenue Excep. Student Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm Avenue Excep. Student Center

1301 W PALM AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/palmavenue

Demographics

Principal: Michael Alexander

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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

Palm Avenue Excep. Student Center

1301 W PALM AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/palmavenue

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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 Avenue Exceptional Student Center is to provide students with educational, enrichment and real-life experiences in a safe and respectful environment that will equip them with the knowledge and skills necessary to become active, responsible and productive members of their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palm Avenue Exceptional Student Center is an educational community that continuously challenges each student to obtain the knowledge and skills necessary to become independent members of their community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alexander, Michael	Principal	Providing instructional leadership, managing faculty and staff, creating a positive culture and climate, developing partnerships with community and parents, implementing district's strategic plan.
Johnson, Delores	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, managing faculty and staff, creating positive culture and climate, developing business, community partnerships and implementing district strategic plan
Gibson, Jodi	School Counselor	Local Educational Agency, check Individual Education Plans for compliance, scheduling,
Byrd, Steven	Teacher, ESE	Coaching teachers, reviewing Functional Behavior Assessments/Behavior Intervention Plans, providing professional development on behavior management strategies
Scholl, Nichole	Teacher, ESE	Coaching teachers, providing professional development, mentoring new teachers, reviewing Individual Education Plans for compliance.
Bartlett, Michelle	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher-responsible for coaching and assisting teachers with instruction. Responsible for checking Individual Education Plans for compliance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2009, Michael Alexander

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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]().	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/7/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	17	10	15	10	93	162
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	5	7	5	0	2	2	1	22

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

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

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

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	17	10	15	10	93	162
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	5	7	5	0	2	2	1	22

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0%	47%	56%	0%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

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	26	38	58	56	56	100	48	50		79	
BLK	30	45		58	67		56	60			
WHT	20	32		62	52			45			
FRL	24	43		55	54		47	57			
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
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

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	51
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	511
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

ELA middle school test scores showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors includes student cognitive ability (Intellectual Disabilities), making adjustment from elementary (self-contained setting) to middle school setting (transitioned between classes), developing behavior plans to increase engagement of students who demonstrate crisis behaviors, identifying and implementing strategies for visually impaired students and utilizing evidence based practices (systematic instruction, differentiated instruction, visual supports, etc.) to increase engagement, independent responses and to meet the unique learning needs of students.

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

There were more Level 1s in Civics. Contributing factors are students cognitive ability (Intellectual Disability and Autism) . Aligning specially design instructional programs to Access Points. Effectively implementing instructional strategies and procedures to meet students academic, behavioral and communication needs. Developing behavior plans to increase engagement for students when the function of the behavior is to escape a task or to seek inappropriate attention.

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.

The greatest gap was in ELA and Science. Contributing factors are students cognitive ability (Intellectual Disability and Autism) . Aligning specially design instructional programs to Access Points. Effectively implementing instructional strategies to meet the academic, behavioral and communication needs of students. Developing lesson plans that incorporate hands-on science experiments, use of visual supports, and implementation of prompting systems during instruction.

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

Algebra and Geometry showed most improvement. Teachers using visual supports, manipulatives and providing error correction during instructional trials. Developing the pacing guide gave math teachers an understanding of the content to effectively address the math standards within their lesson plan and instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance affecting students academic performance and ability to take assessment. Some of our students are medically fragile and are attending Hospital Home bound. Yet they remain on Palm Avenue's enrollment.

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

1. Consistent lesson planning to address the standards within the pacing guide with fidelity.
2. Implementation of professional development provided on evidenced based practices with fidelity.
3. Effectively planning and implementing Assistive Technology (low and high) to meet the learning and communication needs of students.
4. Developing behavior plans to increase engagement of students who misbehave to escape a task or who seeks inappropriate attention.
5. Reviewing web based programs and instructional programs to understand how to effectively use when lesson planning and providing instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing data from Quality Indicators Walk Through Form and Classroom Visitation Rubric survey information/data showed some teachers were not following the pacing guide and using resources provided with fidelity, which impacted the amount of students exposed to the standard. Through implementation of the pacing guide and using resources with fidelity teachers will develop standard aligned lesson plans that will allow them to provide standards based instruction to most students and meet their unique learning needs.
Measurable Outcome:	95% percent of Palm Avenue teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning procedures.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Alexander (alexanderm2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Adhering to the pacing guide and implementation of systematic instruction procedures (prompting, error correction, task analysis and quantified observation documentation) and Quality Indicators are best practices to provide instruction and increase engagement for students with severe to moderate disabilities. Based on Palm Avenue Quality Indicators Walk Through Form and classroom visitation rubric, administration can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing Palm Avenue pacing guides, Quality Indicators provided by district's EE/SS office and principles of systematic instruction that are embedded in instructional programs will allow teachers to address students cognitive levels by exposing them to standard aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to take the Florida State Alternate Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development on Linking Instruction to State Standards

Person Responsible	Michael Alexander (alexanderm2@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate professional development on Data Collection Aligned to Standards

Person Responsible	Delores Johnson (johnsond4@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate professional development on Systematic instruction for Students with Severe to Moderate Disabilities, Implementation of Quality Indicators and Aligning Assistive Technology to Core Content of Standard

Person Responsible	Michael Alexander (alexanderm2@duvalschools.org)

Train teacher on the relationship between SiP and standards-based initiatives.

Person Responsible	Michael Alexander (alexanderm2@duvalschools.org)

Continued walkthroughs by administrative team to identify implementation and fidelity of standards-based instruction, provide feedback and support as needed.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Other specifically relating to Teacher to Teacher Trust

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 5 Essentials Survey, teachers and paraprofessionals at Palm Avenue did not feel supportive of one another and respect one another, personally and professionally. When staff do not trust and support one another it impacts their ability to work cohesively and to collaborate effectively to provide adequate instruction to students.
Measurable Outcome:	Palm Avenue will increase it's mean score to 90 (very strong) on the 5 essential survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided article highlighting tips for how colleagues can build relationships with one another. Teacher will be provided protocols for developing active and interpretive questioning. Colleagues present dilemmas or problems of practice they have experienced, while other colleagues use questioning skills to evaluate the issue and work toward a solution.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In schools with strong Teacher-Teacher Trust, teachers are supportive and respectful of one another, personally and professionally. Resources will be utilized that are recommended by 5 essentials survey for team building activities that will increase trust among teachers and paraprofessionals.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development of "Teacher-Paraprofessional Relationships In the Classroom" during pre-planning

Person Responsible	Delores Johnson (johnsond4@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate Article Review "Relationship Building with Colleagues" during Early Dismissal

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Facilitate "The Issaquah Protocol" during Early Dismissal

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School Safety- Information regarding school safety will be disseminated and reviewed with faculty and staff during pre-planning. Safety drills will be conducted monthly. The Behavior Threat Assessment Team will meet monthly. The School Safety Plan will be reviewed with faculty and staff during Early Dismissal.

Stakeholder relationships- Monthly newsletter will be sent out to stakeholders monthly. School website will be updated with current information. Many of Palm Avenue's stakeholders serve on the School Advisory Council. During these meetings we discuss the affairs of the school. Palm Avenue has established a Facebook account where information is shared with stakeholders.

Palm Avenue will collaborate with DCPS Human Resources department in hiring teachers. Teachers will be provided professional development during Early Return, Early Release and common planning. Teachers will be encouraged to collaborate with one another and novice teachers will be assigned a mentor teacher and provided orientation when hired.

Technology (Go Talk Devices) - Title I Funds are being utilized to purchase assistive technology such as Go Talk Devices to improve two way communication between our students and faculty/ staff which will also contribute to improved student achievement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Palm Avenue believes in involving stakeholders in all aspects of the school environment that are applicable to our students. The PTA and SAC Boards have the responsibility for advising/assisting in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the various school plans, including the SIP and FPEP. All parents are given the opportunity to review the plans and offer their input prior to approval. In addition, a survey will be given annually to all families seeking their input on activities, training, and materials they need to help in meeting their child's learning needs. Results of parent surveys will be reviewed by the PTA and SAC to determine needed changes. During the PTA Board and SAC meeting when the FPEP and/or SIP are reviewed; their feedback along with the input from parents will help determine how the parental involvement funds will be spent. The dates and times of all meetings, training, and workshops will be presented to parents through the school calendar, newsletter, school's website, robocalls, emails and all other school advertisements.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Teacher to Teacher Trust	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00