

Manatee County Public Schools

Palm View K 8 School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	28

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: 9/16/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	77%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	D

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 K-8 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Kaththea	Principal	
Clark, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Burton, Jennifer	Other	Instructional Specialist
Nguyen-Pham, Cindy	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/16/2021, Kaththea Johnson

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.*

2

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

789

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

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

20

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	67	64	76	87	59	66	99	115	156	0	0	0	0	789
Attendance below 90 percent	29	30	45	54	31	34	40	49	92	0	0	0	0	404
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	5	13	30	26	44	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	21	6	0	1	4	29	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	11	26	33	41	76	0	0	0	0	204
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	15	31	43	64	0	0	0	0	179
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	11	10	14	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	53

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	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	20
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

Thursday 9/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	57	73	59	74	68	62	124	149	75	0	0	0	0	741	
Attendance below 90 percent	26	25	19	34	28	22	35	39	33	0	0	0	0	261	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	
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	5	15	31	56	28	0	0	0	135	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	30	44	28	0	0	0	116	

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	4	6	16	31	18	0	0	0	0	75	

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		

2020-21 - 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	57	73	59	74	68	62	124	149	75	0	0	0	0	741	
Attendance below 90 percent	26	25	19	34	28	22	35	39	33	0	0	0	0	261	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	
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	5	15	31	56	28	0	0	0	135	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	30	44	28	0	0	0	116	

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	4	6	16	31	18	0	0	0	0	75	

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				41%	58%	61%	27%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	57%	59%	41%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				92%	52%	54%	38%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				54%	64%	62%	44%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains				70%	63%	59%	63%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79%	55%	52%	41%	54%	52%
Science Achievement				37%	54%	56%	25%	54%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					83%	78%		81%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	56%	-14%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	52%	-21%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	65%	-14%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Kg-2nd: iReady Diagnostic Data for Rdg and Math: Fall 2020, Winter 2021, Spring 2021

3rd-6th: Quarterly Benchmarks for ELA, Math, Science: Q1-Fall, Q2-Winter, FSA-Spring

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	27	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	27	44
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	20
	English Language Learners	25	17	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	20	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	21	42
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	10
	English Language Learners	17	0	17
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	32	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	35	44
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	30
	English Language Learners	0	24	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	24	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	24	40
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	10
	English Language Learners	0	12	35

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	34	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	31	27
	Students With Disabilities	4	8	7
	English Language Learners	17	11	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	44	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	39	41
	Students With Disabilities	21	20	23
	English Language Learners	26	37	50
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	40	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	38	39
	Students With Disabilities	18	27	18
	English Language Learners	25	38	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	52	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	51	62
	Students With Disabilities	18	40	27
	English Language Learners	44	31	38

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	40	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	32
	Students With Disabilities	19	13	12
	English Language Learners	24	22	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56	48	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	47	55
	Students With Disabilities	35	21	32
	English Language Learners	56	56	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	33	16	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	17	30
	Students With Disabilities	13	0	8
	English Language Learners	22	18	25
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	33	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	32	26
	Students With Disabilities	14	9	19
	English Language Learners	9	18	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	36	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	37	29
	Students With Disabilities	4	15	0
	English Language Learners	27	37	30

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	27	32	12	26	39	14	42			
ELL	16	26	30	33	31	40	11	48			
BLK	27	43	36	34	35	17	21	50			
HSP	23	32	35	36	34	46	24	58	60		
MUL	23	36		31	27						
WHT	42	39	29	54	34	26	33	87			
FRL	24	33	35	38	33	36	24	59	52		
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				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	43
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Though our data entered into this 21-22 SIP is reflective of our 18-19 School Grade data, a need to reflect on the 20-21 FSA data is necessary when focusing on trends across all levels, groups, and content areas. Adding 7th and 8th grade last year and becoming a full Kg-8th gr school was challenging in many aspects and compounded with the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the following trends are observed when reviewing 18-19 FSA, 20-21 Quarterly Benchmarks, and 20-21 FSA:

There is a significant decrease in proficiency when comparing 3rd-5th gr (higher proficiency) and 6th-8th grade (lower proficiency) in both ELA and Math content areas (a range difference from 6 percentage points up to 54 percentage points, depending on the content area and grade level). Learning gains both overall and bottom quartile were between 67% and 92% in 18-19, decreasing to an average of 35% in 20-21. All content areas ELA, Math, and Science decreased proficiency and learning gains (both overall and bottom quartile). We have no school grade to compare to 20-21 since our last school grade (18-19) was as an elementary school. Last year was the first year we operated on a 900 point scale (different from our 18-19 grade A reflective of a 700 point scale).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

(continued from 1a.) Our 7th and 8th gr Civics maintained around 60-70% proficient on all our 20-21 progress monitoring data however, our Algebra I started off very low due to staffing vacancies and issues. After adjustments in the Spring of 21, Algebra scores were able to increase to 56% proficient (20-21 EOC) which was more than a 30% point increase from the mid year assessments. All our sub group areas have decreased proficiency and there was a significant difference in number of students who made learning gains compared to last year and those who did not. Our ESE and ESOL subgroups decreased both proficiency and in learning gains in all content areas.

(1b.)

When comparing 20-21 FSA and progress monitoring data with our 18-19 school grade data, all areas decreased which raises a concern in every bucket, including a focus on sub groups. However, using our Federal Index and Power Index, our areas of greatest need for improvement and therefor most focus are the following:

1. MS Acceleration - Algebra I and Geometry
2. Social Studies (EOCs) - Civics
3. Lowest Quartile Learnings Gains in both ELA and Math

Subgroups focusing on: ESE and ESOL (Based on a review of data, many of these students also fall into our L25 lists and therefor have an impact in multiple areas)

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

Contributing factors include the following:

1. Converting from a Kg-5 elementary school to a full Kg-8; doubling capacity in 2 years; adding additional instructional staff and support staff due to adding 3 grade levels and growing existing levels
2. Two new buckets factored into school grade: Social Studies (EOCs) and MS Acceleration
3. Increase in number of students within high needs sub groups: ESE, ESOL
4. Discipline, Trauma, need for SEL and Restorative Practices for students on campus

Actions needed for improvement:

1. Staffing - Filling all vacancies
2. Professional development and training for new staff
3. Instructional support for high impact/focus areas
4. SEL and Restorative Practices - Focus on decreasing behavior disruptions and time spent outside of classroom due to referrals and incidents

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Algebra I and Civics showed the most improvement using progress monitoring data during the 20-21 school year. We do not have 18-19 data to compare to. Unfortunately, no areas improved from 18-19 to 20-21.

*If you break down the grade level data from 19 to 21, the following improvements are observed:

1. 4th gr FSA Math Proficiency increased from 51% to 66% (+15 pts)
- 2, 5th gr FSA Math Proficiency increased from 31% to 33% (+ 2 pts)

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

Contributing factors include:

- Civics: One teacher assigned to all Civics classes; worked weekly with instructional specialist, focused on vocabulary, graphic organizers, and exposure to question stems and content; focused on rigor and exposure.
- Algebra I: Second semester, moved Coach to teach Algebra I class, added ALEKS program for an additional Algebra block of instruction, implemented Algabrew (before school homework and tutoring assistance).
- 4th gr Math: Focus on facilitated collaborative planning and learning focused instructional framework; Acaletics math club second semester went to ability grouping classes; February to May-push in Angels, focused on additional math remediation of standards from prior semester.

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

-Small group instruction and continued use of formative assessments and data to monitor progress and drive instructional decisions.

- An earlier jump on L25 data and lists of ESE/ESOL students along with professional learning and support with accommodations and interventions.
- Focus on Intensive Reading and Intensive Math classes accelerating learning for students, preparing with vocabulary and previewing prior to core class.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- TLCS: Focused on high impact areas such as ELL (ACCESS scores, Can-Do Charts, Accommodations) and ESE (Training for pulling and using IEPs, adjusting lesson plans to support, modifying assignments/assessments)
- Learning Focused Micro PDs and Debrief sessions focused on instructional practices that have highest effect
- Data Focused sessions done quarterly, use of By the Numbers and Gap Eliminator Process
- Facilitated Collaborative Planning weekly
- SEL (Character Strong; Purposeful People) and Restorative Practices (Pilot; Advisory Period-20 mins daily)

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

Heavy support and timeline of implementation for sustainability in the following areas:

1. Standards based planning and high quality instruction that is rigorous and grade level (Learning Focused Framework; Facilitated collaborative planning); Learning Focused lesson template for consistent planning
2. Scheduling - Fidelity to instructional blocks and Advisory (SEL)
3. Restorative Practices (full school-wide training for pilot program; training leaders to build capacity within teams)
4. Gap eliminator process - Done quarterly, training of ILT and leadership to build capacity within teams
5. Implementation of Formative Assessments (common across grade levels and departments)
6. Building capacity with awareness of subgroups and L25 students, planning for small group instruction and differentiation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	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.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	<p>(1) Grades 3-8 overall learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains in ELA and Math will increase to at least 75%.</p> <p>(2) Grades 3-8 Student proficiency in ELA & Math will increase to at least 50%.</p> <p>(3) Grades 3-8 Student proficiency in 5th & 8th grade Science will increase to at least 50%.</p> <p>...as measured by the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessments in grades 3-8.</p> <p>(4) Grades 7-8 Student proficiency in Civics will increase to at least 70%</p> <p>(5) Grades 7-8 Student proficiency in MS Acceleration will increase to at least 70%</p> <p>...as measured by the 2021-2022 EOCs in Civics and Algebra I.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Monitoring will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Quarterly instructional goals (see PV K-8 Instructional Expectations and Handbook) -Observational data: Walk throughs, evaluations, lessons plans -Facilitated Collaborative Planning - use of One drive and Schoology group to post plans and resources -Curriculum and Data Binder - living and built on throughout the year; collection of quarterly BM data and action plans -TLC calendar - Reflective of focused sessions (collaboration, use of data, Learning Focused pd, etc.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Standards Based Planning focused in all content areas (ELA, Math, Science, Civics, Algebra I, etc.) accomplished through weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade level teams and a member of the Leadership Team (Instructional Coach, Specialist, Administrator).</p> <p>Data Driven Decision making accomplished through grade level TLCs with a focus on the PV K-8 Gap Eliminator process and formative data supported by members of the Leadership Team; focus on L25 students in ELA and Math, ESE and ESOL students, and writing across ALL content areas including Science, Social Studies, and MS Elective areas.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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).</p> <p>PV K-8 is a Learning Focused framework school, as well; reference research and data behind the 90-90-90 schools and high effect strategies.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Standards Based Planning and Rigorous Instruction:

1. Assign Leadership Team Members to grade levels and specific weekly meeting times.
2. Using the "Palm View Planning Process" and Learning Focused lesson plan template, begin by following required district pacing guide and curriculum maps, use of test specs and B.E.S.T. standards to unpack standards.
3. Unpack priority (and stacking) standards and determine LEQ's and learning objectives (What students need to know and do).
4. Plan formative assessments.
5. Plan lessons and activities; focus on rigor and scaffolding
6. Review data from formative and plan next steps.

Person Responsible Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

Data Driven Decision Making:

1. Assign Leadership Team Members to grade levels and specific TLC scheduled sessions to support the use of Data to make instructional decisions.
2. Use of Palm View Gap Eliminator action plan process quarterly, following Benchmark assessments pattern scored by the district.
3. Use of Palm View formative common assessments, entered into School City; utilized with lesson planning and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The fact that Palm View expanded to include 6th through 8th grade fully converting to a Kg-8 school and the use of 2020-2021 discipline data, a need was identified for creating a positive and safe culture that allows for learning to take place. Break down of discipline data identified the following:</p> <p>Disruption/Inappropriate Behavior: 446 -> Disruptive Behavior (138) + In Behavior (190) + Defiance (118)</p> <p>Disrespect: 242 -> Authority (154) + Others (88)</p> <p>Agression: 190 -> Sesir Fights (40) + Agression (120) + Non Phy Agression (21) + Fighting non Sesir (9)</p> <p>High number of level 4 offenses</p> <p>195 Sesir Offenses: Aggression & Fighting</p> <p>Top 5 problem areas identified in referrals: 1. Inap Behavior (190); 2. Disruptive Authority (154); 3. Disrespectful Behavior (138); 4. Agression (120); 5. Defiance (118)</p> <p>Loss of instructional time due to discipline: Pull out/Statements, OSS/ISS/ATOSS</p> <p>As a result, it was determined that action was needed and PV K-8 opted to be pilot the Restorative Practices initiative for the 21-22 school year and focus on using our SEL Character Strong program to accomplish our 2021-2022 #buildingUPk8 Mission: I will commit to being an active participant in our positive and productive community, building value and academic success for all learners every day.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Decrease the overall level of discipline offenses by 5% as measured by the 2021-2022 school year referral and incident data compared to the 2020-2021 data.</p> <p>Monitoring will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Quarterly instructional goals (see PV K-8 Instructional Expectations and Handbook) -Observational data during Advisory Period: Walk throughs, evaluations, lessons plans (Schoolology Group)
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TLC calendar - Quarterly professional learning and debrief/planning sessions focused on Restorative Practices and use of SEL Character Strong program (Advisory Period) -Quarterly discipline reports pulled by leadership team and reviewed; evaluate status of implementation goals and align targeted support. -MTSS-B list of student referrals and process for following up and supporting (Weekly)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Restorative Practices pilot initiative school-wide:</p> <p>Implement a 20 minute Advisory Period daily for Kg-8th grade classes, where Character Strong (Purposeful People; MS SEL) is used to compliment a Restorative Practice approach to help build value and community across our campus; building relationships for the sake of improving the learning environment and therefore increasing academic success for all students every day.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Restorative practices in schools is a way of work that builds trust, respect, optimism, and intentionality among staff and students. It is a preventative approach built on strong relationships, as well as a restorative approach when relationships are damaged. It works seamlessly with SEL instruction and best practices for classroom management and instruction. For more information, please visit https://www.iirp.edu/images/IIRP_SaferSanerSchools_Program_Overview_19-08-09.pdf.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Action Steps/Strategies:

Restorative Practice training for all staff - pilot; Initial Tr 7/26, 7/27

Advisory Period 20 mins daily (Counselors-character strong, rest. pract, building relationships)

PBIS - Training for all staff (Larissa Bennett)

Consistency for expectations and discipline: Agendas, Initial training/collaboration facilitated by admin and deans; communication with students/parents

Coaching - focus on the inconsistent, use teacher leaders as models; establish calendar for walk throughs, feedback, and timelines

Survey staff and families - Semester 1 and Semester 2

Leadership Team: Calibration; difficult conversations; coaching

Non negotiables inside Faculty Handbook - PV K-8 Expectations

Quarterly Assemblies: Set expectations; use data for each quarter

Timeline:

-July/Aug 21 - Training School-Wide (2 days-Restorative practices)

-Aug 21 - Implement Advisory Period (20 mins daily); Schoology Group-resources for SEL and lesson plans for Advisory; All teachers create and implement Inclusive and Welcoming Routine to welcome students daily

-Sept 21-Dec 21 - Walk through Advisory Periods; provide feedback and support; TLC scheduled professional learning focused on SEL and RP

-Jan 21-May 21 - Evaluate status of implementation: RP and SEL, Advisory Period - Align individual support and additional training needs

Person

Responsible Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	We will improve student achievement in the area of ELA 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.
Description and Rationale:	

Measurable Outcome: (1) Grades 3-5 Student proficiency in ELA & Math will increase to at least 50%.

Monitoring: Monitoring will include:
 -Quarterly instructional goals (see PV K-8 Instructional Expectations and Handbook)
 -Observational data: Walk throughs, evaluations, lessons plans
 -Facilitated Collaborative Planning - use of One drive and Schoology group to post plans and resources
 -Curriculum and Data Binder - living and built on throughout the year; collection of quarterly BM data and action plans
 -TLC calendar - Reflective of focused sessions (collaboration, use of data, Learning Focused pd, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards Based Planning focused in the content area of ELA, accomplished through weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade level teams and a member of the Leadership Team (Instructional Coach, Specialist, Administrator).
 Data Driven Decision making accomplished through grade level TLCs with a focus on the PV K-8 Gap Eliminator process and formative data supported by members of the Leadership Team; focus on L25 students in ELA and Math, ESE and ESOL students, and writing across ALL content areas including Science, Social Studies, and MS Elective areas.

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).
 PV K-8 is a Learning Focused framework school, as well; reference research and data behind the 90-90-90 schools and high effect strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Standards Based Planning and Rigorous Instruction:

1. Assign Leadership Team Members to grade levels and specific weekly meeting times for ELA planning.
2. Using the "Palm View Planning Process" and Learning Focused lesson plan template, begin by following required district pacing guide and curriculum maps, use of test specs and B.E.S.T. standards to unpack standards.
3. Unpack priority (and stacking) standards and determine LEQ's and learning objectives (What students need to know and do).
4. Plan formative assessments.

5. Plan lessons and activities; focus on rigor and scaffolding
6. Review data from formative and plan next steps.

Person Responsible Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

Data Driven Decision Making:

1. Assign Leadership Team Members to grade levels and specific TLC scheduled sessions to support the use of Data to make instructional decisions in ELA.
2. Use of Palm View Gap Eliminator action plan process quarterly, following Quarterly ELA Benchmark assessments pattern scored by the district.
3. Use of Palm View formative common assessments in ELA, entered into School City; utilized with lesson planning and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Kaththea Johnson (johnsonk@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Palm View K-8 School falls into the very high category using the rating scale from Safe Schools Alex.

PV K-8 Discipline Mtg: 6/30/21

Problem/Concern:

High number of level 4 offenses

195 Sesir Offenses: Aggression & Fighting

Top 5 problem areas identified in referrals: 1. Inap Behavior (190); 2. Disruptive Authority (154); 3. Disrespectful Behavior (138); 4. Aggression (120); 5. Defiance (118)

Loss of instructional time due to discipline: Pull out/Statements, OSS/ISS/ATOSS

Disruption/Inappropriate Behavior: 446 -> Disruptive Behavior (138) + In Behavior (190) + Defiance (118)

Disrespect: 242 -> Authority (154) + Others (88)

Aggression: 190 -> Sesir Fights (40) + Aggression (120) + Non Phy Aggression (21) + Fighting non Sesir (9)

Barriers:

Changing culture: Middle school to ES Campus, New Dean leadership, new teachers/staff every year due to expansion

Lack of training in PBIS, behavior tools - Common language for PBIS

Inconsistency with expectations (feedback from teachers/leaders)

Staff/Student/Family Relationships - Disrespect to authority

Strategies:

Restorative Practice training for all staff - pilot; Initial Tr 7/26, 7/27

Advisory Period 20 mins daily (Counselors-character strong, rest. pract, building relationships)

PBIS - Training for all staff (Larissa Bennett)

Consistency for expectations and discipline: Agendas, Initial training/collaboration facilitated by admin and deans; communication with students/parents

Coaching - focus on the ones NOT consistent, use teacher leaders as models; establish calendar for walk throughs, feedback, and timelines

Subgroups/minorities -

Survey staff

Leadership Team: Calibration; difficult conversations; coaching

Non negotiables inside Faculty

Quarterly Assemblies: Set expectations; use data for each quarter

Start the year with Student Success Plans and Parent Meetings - August 2021; George Schrier-share list; 2 fights = BAM contract

Distribution of marijuana; Vape testing kits (Ardilla); Nurse observation

Next steps; reflections; timelines:

Review processes and ask: How can we streamline? What can we omit? Alternative Ideas: Go to them (instead of pulling in the office; Pulling strategically outside of core classes; Before/After school time; refine the statement template; reading the referral to students; Need search form to put in discipline form (need template) to include process-adults, parent contact, etc.;

Teaching the PV Way: Respectful, Responsible, Safe - Posters for areas

#buildingUPk8 - Positive and productive community, building value

Timeline:

July/Aug 21 - Training School-Wide (2 days Restorative practices)

Aug 24 - Implement Advisory Period (20 mins daily); Selectology Group resources for SEL and

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.

2021-2022 #buildingUPk8 Mission:

I will commit to be an active participant in our positive and productive community, building value and academic success for all learners every day.

Building Blocks of Mission include:

- SEL Program (Character Strong-Purposeful People) and Restorative Practices Initiative - Advisory Period 20 minutes daily, built into Master Schedule for Kg-8
- Monique Burr Foundation: Child and Teen Safety Matters course and materials
- PBIS - School wide goals and common language, currency for incentives
- Quarterly Awards
- Annual Parent Informational Meetings; Family Engagement Events; Soar in 4 - Involve families and all stakeholders in current learning such as Character Trait of the Month, academics, and building parents' capacity to work with students; seek out input to support school initiatives and goals.
- 21st Century Program; Y-Dash (YMCA)
- Middle School Athletics

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

Leadership team; Counselors; Deans
 Classroom teachers
 Instructional Support and Non-Instructional Personnel
 Families/Guardians
 Students
 Business Partners; Churches

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00