Ponte Vedra Palm Valley Rawlings Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ponte Vedra Palm Valley Rawlings Elementary School

610 US HIGHWAY A1A N, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

http://www-pvmkr.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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	13%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

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.

The faculty and staff of PVPV/Rawlings Elementary support the St. Johns County School District's mission to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of PVPV/Rawlings Elementary support the St. Johns County School District's vision statement that all students will abide by the six Pillars of Character: Citizenship, Responsibility, Trustworthiness, Fairness, Caring and Respect.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Nunes, Jennifer	Instructional Coach
Garlanger, Rita	Assistant Principal
Brubaker, Lisa	Assistant Principal
VanHousen, Catherine	Principal

Duties

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

The school principal guides the vision for the use of data-based decision-making, provides continual oversight and support for the effective implementation of the MTSS process, and creates the framework for PLC team analysis of student achievement and instructional strategies for remediation and intervention. The principal also works closely with the school's Safety Committee to ensure the safety of all our school's 1,025 students, so that meaningful instruction can take place. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards. The principal and assistant principals evaluate and provide feedback to faculty about their instructional practices.
Both assistant principals work closely with the principal and guidance counselors to evaluate and support all students identified by the Early Warning System, plus lower quartile achievers in reading and math, and develop academic and social/emotional support plans for struggling students to ensure nobody slips through the gaps. APs also are responsible for providing curriculum resources for all teachers, and for ensuring alignment between state standards and instructional practices.
The instructional literacy coach identifies and analyzes existing scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment and intervention approaches. She identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole-school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. The ILC manages current MTSS

student data and fidelity checks, and serves as key communicator of the MTSS process between teachers, parents, and students.

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	3	13	15	8	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	3	13	9	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	3	13	9	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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?

The trend for our ELA lower quartile learning gains has grown from 56% in 2015-16 up to 61% in 2016-17, then back down to 55% in 2017-18. We devoted major resources to ELA lower quartile students in 2016-17, but were unable to last year, so we saw the drop in learning gains.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Our 4th grade ELA proficiency rate decreased from 86% to 82%. Our 3rd grade math proficiency rate decreased from 87% to 83%.

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

Science scores were 33% higher than the state average. Although we exceeded the state average in all categories, our ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% was closest to the state average. ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% for our school were 55%, which is 7% higher than the state average of 48%.

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

Our math learning gains for our lower quartile increased from 73% to 77%. Our students typically show solid performance in math.

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

2017-18 was the second year of our PLC journey, with more than two dozen teachers immersed in the common language and commitments of working as collaborative grade-level teams. Our PLC journey was furthered, with many more teachers engaged in the cycle of data analysis of common assessments and reteaching.

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	83%	72%	56%	85%	68%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	59%	55%	70%	59%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	48%	56%	53%	46%
Math Achievement	88%	77%	62%	87%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	83%	67%	59%	77%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	58%	47%	75%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	88%	68%	55%	88%	66%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (3)	13 (13)	15 (9)	8 (7)	14 (4)	8 (6)	61 (42)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (0)	1 (2)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	3 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	10 (9)	12 (12)	23 (22)

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
03	2018	83%	78%	5%	57%	26%
	2017	85%	80%	5%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	82%	74%	8%	56%	26%
	2017	86%	74%	12%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2018	82%	73%	9%	55%	27%
	2017	84%	75%	9%	53%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	83%	80%	3%	62%	21%
	2017	87%	80%	7%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	92%	83%	9%	62%	30%
	2017	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2018	90%	79%	11%	61%	29%
	2017	91%	80%	11%	57%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	87%	73%	14%	55%	32%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

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	58	58	48	73	69	66	63				
ASN	86	73		95	87						
HSP	70	63	40	77	70	71	77				
MUL	88			88							
WHT	84	70	58	89	85	81	90				
FRL	79	67	58	83	74	76	89				
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	67	60	52	73	76	62	65				
ASN	82	79		91	92						
HSP	80	75	70	82	75	73	73				

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
MUL	94	50		88	100						
WHT	85	73	58	89	84	71	84				
FRL	75	61	56	84	73	65	57				

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	ELA Learning Gains for lowest quartile students.
Rationale	Having only 55% of our lower quartile students make learning gains in ELA is unacceptable. We were able to boost that by six percentage points the previous year when we devoted more resources to the effort. As a school-wide PLC, we all commit to redoubling our efforts to see the number of our students make learning gains increase significantly.
Intended Outcome	At least 65% of our lowest quartile ELA students will make a learning gain this year.
Point Person	Catherine VanHousen (catherine.vanhousen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	Resources will be allocated to support an after-school learning camp to which all our lower quartile students will be invited, with free transportation available. Teachers and curriculum will be identified and scheduled.
Person Responsible	Lisa Brubaker (lisa.eckert-brubaker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	iReady and other grade-level common assessments completed by our camp students will be used to track their progress and assist teachers to remediate as needed.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nunes (jennifer.nunes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Math Proficiency for lowest quartile students.
Rationale	Math is traditionally our strong suit, and we want to build upon our successes to further prepare our students for middle school and beyond.
Intended Outcome	We will raise the proficiency for our lowest quartile math students from 77% to 80%.
Point Person	Catherine VanHousen (catherine.vanhousen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Our after-school Ramp Up Camp targets math skills for our lower quartile students, in addition to its focus on reading skills. We also strategically schedule our two SAI tutors for push-in math sessions to support our students with remediation and reteaching.
Person Responsible	Lisa Brubaker (lisa.eckert-brubaker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	We have increased our PLC accountability of the work done in our grade-level collaborative teams, and expect to see evidence of common assessments and remediation strategies. Math skill levels for our lower quartile students will be monitored with iReady and other grade-appropriate formative assessments.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nunes (jennifer.nunes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Our students will take pride in joining our Kindness Crew.
Rationale	We conducted more than 80 bullying investigations last year. Only three were substantiated. We believe a Positive Behavior Support plan to educate students and parents about bothering versus bullying, Character Counts, making friends and being kind will help reduce the bullying claims.
Intended Outcome	Fewer than 20 bullying complaints will be filed.
Point Person	Catherine VanHousen (catherine.vanhousen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	School-wide PBS plan -- Kindness Crew -- rolled out via parent and teacher newsletters, banners hung throughout school, video lessons shown on the morning news, and incentives for kind behavior provided. Tier 1 classroom lessons provided by school counselors. Tier 2 small group lessons will be held for students who need support in social skills. Tier 3 intensive support will be offered through MTSS by our new mental health counselor.
Person Responsible	Lisa Brubaker (lisa.eckert-brubaker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Discipline referrals and bullying investigations tracked by assistant principals.
Person Responsible	Lisa Brubaker (lisa.eckert-brubaker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)