

St. Johns County School District

Ponte Vedra High School



2019-20 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ponte Vedra High School

460 DAVIS PARK RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

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

Demographics

Principal: Fredrik Oberkehr

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (78%) 2014-15: A (86%)
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 was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ponte Vedra High School

460 DAVIS PARK RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>3%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>14%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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 2020, all students will consistently make choices that reflect district standards of good character.

By the year 2020, all students will continually seek and share new knowledge and experiences related to their personal interests and goals.

By the year 2020, each student will master all academic standards set forth by the district.

By the year 2020, 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Oberkehr, Fredrik	Principal	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 meeting, 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 Rtl review meetings with parents and teachers, review Rtl plans, finalize Rtl referral packets, and refer students and parents to appropriate community resources. Some members provide ongoing professional development for our Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Administrators perform classroom observations and schedule meetings with teachers to provide constructive feedback. Together, the Leadership teams work 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.
O'Brian, Jeannine	Assistant Principal	
Harris, Guy	Assistant Principal	
Asplen, Mari Ellen	Other	
Ashenfelder, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Burkert, Daniel	Registrar	
Beech, Bud	Dean	
Stanton, Tom	Dean	

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	463	454	450	452	1819
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	81	94	156	374
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	11	12	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	7	4	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	12	10	46

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	6	21	12	11	50

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	4	1	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4

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

82

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	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 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	20	14	15	25	74

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	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 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	20	14	15	25	74

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	85%	74%	56%	85%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	51%	69%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	50%	42%	62%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	90%	73%	51%	87%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	65%	58%	48%	59%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	55%	45%	69%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	93%	86%	68%	95%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	88%	73%	95%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	463 (0)	454 (0)	450 (0)	452 (0)	1819 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	43 (56)	81 (66)	94 (66)	156 (121)	374 (309)
One or more suspensions	14 (44)	10 (12)	11 (14)	12 (14)	47 (84)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (6)	20 (26)	7 (10)	4 (24)	36 (66)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	11 (13)	13 (13)	12 (13)	10 (9)	46 (48)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	84%	75%	9%	55%	29%
	2018	89%	74%	15%	53%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	85%	74%	11%	53%	32%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	85%	76%	9%	53%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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
2019	93%	87%	6%	67%	26%
2018	95%	84%	11%	65%	30%
Compare		-2%			

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	94%	88%	6%	70%	24%
2018	96%	87%	9%	68%	28%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	79%	7%	61%	25%
2018	83%	79%	4%	62%	21%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	81%	11%	57%	35%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	89%	77%	12%	56%	33%
Compare		3%			

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	44	44	46	58	58	61	53	81		100	35
ASN	84	54		71	73		91			94	94
BLK	67	45		82	50						
HSP	83	58	69	87	74	75	93	92		100	83
MUL	100	50									
WHT	85	60	59	91	65	79	93	92		98	72
FRL	68	40	47	83	60	82	82	91		92	67
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

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	79

ESSA Federal Index	
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	791
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

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

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	81
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
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	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Overall, the lowest performance components are ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% with both components at 59%. This is a 10% drop for ELA Learning Gains from 69% in 2018, and a 9% drop for ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 68% in 2018. Contributing factors include the continuing identification of differentiated strategies for use by teachers, and the incorporation of technology in the ELA classroom.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 is the ELA Learning Gains with a score of 59% in 2019 compared to 69% in 2018. Contributing factors include the continuing identification of Level 1 and 2 students in the ELA classroom, and the implementation of progress monitoring to support overall achievement.

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 data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state is Math Achievement at 90% compared to the state average of 51%. This shows a value that is 39% above the state average. Contributing factors to this positive trend include the use of differentiated instruction, the incorporation of technology in the math classroom, and the PLC model.

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

The data component that shows the most improvement is Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%. The score for 2018 was 65% compared to an 11% increase in 2019 at 76%. The actions taken include the incorporation of technology in the math classroom (IXL), and the implementation of math tutors to help differentiate and remediate instruction.

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

One area of potential concern in the EWS data is Attendance Below 90% of the 12th grade cohort (121).

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

1. Increase ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% by 2% to 61% in the 2019-2020 school year.
2. Increase Math Learning Gains by 2% to 67% in the 2019-2020 school year.
3. To facilitate continual campus-wide positive character development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of Lowest 25% by 2% to 61% in the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale	The Needs Assessment Data indicated a downward trend of 10% during the 2018-2019 school year in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome will be to increase the ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% by 2% from 59% to 61% in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy for increasing overall ELA Learning Gains will include progress monitoring Level 1 and 2 students three times annually. In addition, the implementation of a technology based Lexiled reading comprehension program for differentiated instruction based on student need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring of Level 1 and 2 students allows for progressive and continual data collection and analysis to enhance student achievement. The level of evidence needed for this strategy will be the increase in individual student Lexile level. The criteria used to determine the implementation of this strategy will include the 2018-2019 ELA FSA data, and the Needs Assessment Data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieve 3000 Level Set progress monitoring tool-2 times annually of all level 1 and level 2 students in the ELA classroom. 2. Implementation of Study Island reading comprehension platform in the 10th grade ELA Classroom based on student need. 3. Implementation of ELA/Reading tutor for differentiated instruction in ELA classroom based on student need.
Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Math Learning Gains by 2% to 67% in the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale	The Needs Assessment Data indicated an upward trend of 1% during the 2018-2019 school year in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome will be to increase the Math Learning Gains by 2% from 65% in 2019 to 67% in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy for increasing overall Math Learning Gains will include the use of IXL, a progressive technology based math program, that allows for standards based math practice and progress monitoring. In addition, the use of differentiated instruction provided by math tutors based on formal and informal standards based assessments to meet the needs of individual students will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring of Level 1 and 2 students allows for progressive and continual data collection and analysis to enhance student achievement. The level of evidence needed for this strategy will be the increase in individual student math achievement. The criteria used to determine the implementation of this strategy will include the 2018-2019 Math EOC assessments, and the Needs Assessment Data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of technology based math remediation IXL program in the math classrooms based on student need. 2. Use of math tutors for practice and remediation based on student need. 3. Use of technology based math remediation Algebra Nation program in the Algebra 1 classroom based on student need.
Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	To facilitate continual campus-wide positive character development.
Rationale	Continual character development provides for the collaboration of administration, faculty, students, parents, and the community in a progressive and positive manner. In addition, this collaboration allows for a positive and safe learning environment where students social, emotional, and academic need are met.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome of this goal will be participation in the Positively PV campaign which identifies students, faculty, and staff that exemplify the Six Pillars of Character in alignment with the district wide Character Counts initiative.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mari Ellen Asplen (asplen.mariellen@sjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy for increasing overall campus-wide positive character development will include the monthly identification of students, faculty, and staff that exemplify one of the Six Pillars of Character. In addition, recognition of this achievement will be advertised and distributed campus-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rational for selecting this strategy is based on the district wide Character Counts program.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Campus-wide advertisement campaign describing the Positively PV program is continually promoted on all communication platforms: twitter, Shark Bytes, digital media boards. 2. Establishing a rubric for the selection of Positively PV candidates for open nomination of staff and students by staff, students, or community members by email to Mari Ellen Asplen. 3. Creating a selection board for nominated candidates. 4. Distribution of Positively PV Character awards to nominated recipients along with recognition in the advertisement campaign on all communication platforms.
Person Responsible	Mari Ellen Asplen (asplen.mariellen@sjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

N/A