St. Johns County School District

Ponte Vedra High School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ponte Vedra High School

460 DAVIS PARK RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

http://www-pvhs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	3%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	14%

School Grades History

Year	**2017-18**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2014-15**
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

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.

Preparing students today for life tomorrow through academics, discipline, and character development. All day, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of PVHS is relayed in four distinct statements and is emulated by all levels from administration to support staff:
By the year 2019, all students will consistently make choices that reflect district standards of good character.
By the year 2019, all students will continually seek and share new knowledge and experiences related to their personal interests and goals.
By the year 2019, each student will master all academic standards set forth by the district.
By the year 2019, all students will consistently and willingly identify community needs and proactively take action for improvement through service learning.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Oberkehr, Fredrik	Principal
Fonseca, Gina	Assistant Principal
Harris, Guy	Assistant Principal
Asplen, Mari Ellen	Other
Ashenfelder, Jennifer	School Counselor
Burkert, Daniel	Registrar
Beech, Bud	Dean
Stanton, Tom	Dean
O'Brian, Jeannine	SAC Member

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The Leadership team works closely to align the goals of the School Improvement Plan with the specific needs of both individual students and teachers. The responsibilities of the core team members vary from person to person as needed throughout the school year. All attend the weekly core meetings, help develop the agenda for the meetings, participate in gap analysis, participate in parent conferences, review school-wide progress monitoring information, and provide training specific to his/her area of expertise. Various team members are responsible for gathering attendance, behavior, progress monitoring, and testing data. Others help develop Tier II and Tier III academic and behavior plans, attend RtI review meetings with parents and teachers, review RtI plans, finalize RtI referral packets, and refer students and parents to appropriate community resources. Some members

provide ongoing professional development for our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Administrators perform classroom observations and schedule meetings with teachers to provide constructive feedback. Together, the Leadership teams works to ensure that the needs of all members of the PVHS community are being met in the best way possible. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	66	66	121	309
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	12	14	14	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	10	24	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	9	48

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	14	15	25	74

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	1	1	3	4	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	7

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	50	92	109	282
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	16	16	10	83
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	18	16	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	12	14	62
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	20	22	77

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	50	92	109	282
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	16	16	10	83
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	18	16	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	12	14	62
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	20	22	77

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Overall the lowest performance component is Math Learning Gains at 64% followed closely by Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% at 65%. The most identifiable trend is in the Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% from 2017 at 69% to 65% in 2018. This demonstrates a 4% downward slide/trend in this group.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2017 is the gains in the lowest 25% Math scores. The scores for this group in 2017 were 69% and were 65% in 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The two categories where our students scored closest to the state average are overall ELA Learning Gains, where the school score was 69% and state score was 63%, a positive 16% gap and overall Math Learning gains, where the school score was 64% and the state score was 48%, also a positive 16% gap.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA Lowest 25%. These scores showed an overall 6% improvement from 2017 at 62% to 2018 at 68%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The implementation of the Achieve 3000 computerized reading comprehension system aids our struggling students in all 5 critical FSA areas. In addition, our 10th grade ELA team utilizes the Study Island platform to reinforce the critical reading skills necessary to build reading stamina. We also utilize the Teengagement reading series which highlights hi-interest reading units that are lexiled to reinforce these critical skills. The Instructional Literacy Coach provides on-going professional development to teachers in the areas of reading comprehension skills across the content areas to aid in this instruction. We created a blended content area model for the delivery of reading instruction that focuses on the integration of reading skills in the Social Studies and ELA curriculum. These classes are supported with one content area teacher and a reading specialist each day.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	87%	67%	56%	87%	71%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	59%	53%	69%	56%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	52%	44%	65%	48%	38%
Math Achievement	87%	66%	51%	81%	68%	43%
Math Learning Gains	64%	55%	48%	62%	51%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	45%	55%	45%	38%
Science Achievement	95%	78%	67%	96%	88%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	81%	71%	97%	85%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	56 (31)	66 (50)	66 (92)	121 (109)	309 (282)
One or more suspensions	44 (41)	12 (16)	14 (16)	14 (10)	84 (83)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (9)	26 (20)	10 (18)	24 (16)	66 (63)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	13 (16)	13 (20)	13 (12)	9 (14)	48 (62)

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
09	2018	89%	74%	15%	53%	36%
	2017	85%	74%	11%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	85%	76%	9%	53%	32%
	2017	85%	73%	12%	50%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	84%	11%	65%	30%
2017	95%	86%	9%	63%	32%
Compare		0%			

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	96%	87%	9%	68%	28%
2017	94%	86%	8%	67%	27%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	83%	79%	4%	62%	21%
2017	80%	78%	2%	60%	20%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	89%	77%	12%	56%	33%
2017	89%	78%	11%	53%	36%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	45	51	50	61	45	52	76	90		82	9
ASN	85	56		85	73		100	100		100	50
BLK	83	73		82							
HSP	84	66		82	66	54	91	94		95	53
MUL	83	75		90	80		100				
WHT	87	70	70	88	63	66	95	97		97	72
FRL	70	77	74	73	55	58	81	94		84	38

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	46	45	45	59	49	56	76	79		79	23
ASN	81	70		82	69		100	93		100	82
BLK	80	60		67	36						
HSP	78	71	60	80	48	60	95	100		95	65
MUL	82										
WHT	85	68	62	87	60	70	95	95		97	67
FRL	69	67	52	77	59	70	81	87		94	47

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Increase student proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC
Rationale	The school data for both 2017 and 2018 respectively indicates a need for increased support with regard to both overall Math Learning Gains and Learning Gains within the Lowest 25%. The trend data also indicates a decline in the achievement of the Lowest 25% in Math from 2017 at 69% to 65% in 2018. Focus on the skills with specific regard to the Algebra 1 EOC will help to close this gap.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to increase overall Math Learning Gains and the Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% in Math by 2% to 66%.
Point Person	Gina Fonseca (gina.fonseca@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	The action steps that will be used to achieve this goal will be; 1. The strategic use of remedial math tutors to remediate standards based math instruction. 2. The use of the Algebra Nation math resources. 3. The implementation of the IXL Remedial Math Program for skill practice and mastery.
Person Responsible	Gina Fonseca (gina.fonseca@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Math Tutors - will be monitored through the use of both formal and informal assessments that are standards based and student specific with regard to student skill mastery. 2. Algebra Nation - Classroom observations will be used to monitor the strategies being taught and then implemented by students; analysis of test scores based upon use of these strategies. 3. IXL Remedial Math Program - Observation of students using the IXL program in the classroom environment will be used along with analysis of assessment results.
Person Responsible	Gina Fonseca (gina.fonseca@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Increase students' ability to utilize multiple text resources and graphic organizers to improve comprehension within reading application.
Rationale	The needs assessment data for 2018 indicates school overall ELA Learning Gains at 69% as compared to the state ELA Gains of 63%. This is an area where we have determined a need for continued improvement.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is an overall increase in ELA Learning Gains in the 2018-2019 school year by 2% to 71%.
Point Person	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	The action steps to achieve this goal will be; 1. The implementation of the Achieve 3000 computerized platform for reading comprehension 2. The use of the Study Island platform to build reading stamina and skill mastery 3. The use of the Teengagement reading program; a high interest reading program to enhance skill development and reading comprehension. 4. Professional development rounds conducted by the Instructional Literacy Coach to aid content area teachers in comprehension and reading strategy development and implementation.
Person Responsible	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Achieve 3000 - Monitor the frequency of implementation by both content area teachers and Intensive Reading teachers. 2. Study Island - Review individual and group student progress with benchmark analysis, and remediate when necessary. 3. Teengagement - Monitor student progress on lexiled passages with regard to FSA categories. 4. Professional Development - Use Needs Assessment Surveys and classroom observations to determine the effectiveness of this practice.
Person Responsible	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	To increase the level of teacher effectiveness as determied by the values on the scale of PLC self-reflection.
Rationale	The PLC process allows all teachers and members of the leadership team to focus on the business of collaboration with regard to a standards based curriculum that is data driven and allows teachers to utilize the common formative and summative process to drive instruction.
Intended Outcome	To continue to progress on the PLC journey by having teams identify the Guaranteed Viable Curriculum, to aid in the creation of common formative and summative assessments that will drive data based decision making.
Point Person	Fredrik Oberkehr (fredrik.oberkehr@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	The action steps that will be used to achieve this goal will be; 1. Attendance at the PLC Institute and district and school-based in-services. 2. Provided selective content specific common planning and protect time for PLC collaboration. 3. Implementation of school-wide Deliberate Practice.
Person Responsible	Fredrik Oberkehr (fredrik.oberkehr@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Monitoring this step will include a record of participation in institute/or other professional development activities. 2. The master schedule will be used to create the time for this action step, and the use of a PLC binder for SMART goals, agendas, meeting notes and evidence will be reviewed for need and effectiveness. 3. The I-Observation platform will be used to monitor the individual Deliberate Practice Growth Plan for each faculty member.
Person Responsible	Gina Fonseca (gina.fonseca@stjohns.k12.fl.us)