



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ponte Vedra Palm Valley Rawlings Elementary School

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

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jesse Gates**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (82%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (84%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">13%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17%</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.**

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. We will "Work Hard, Be Kind, and Be Awesome!"

#### **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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nunes, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>
Whaley, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	<p>The 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 Assistant principal also serves as LEA.</p>
Brubaker, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<p>The 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 assistant principal also serves as LEA.</p>
Gates, Jesse	Principal	<p>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.</p>

**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	144	158	155	188	176	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1001
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	6	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

66

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/28/2019

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

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

## 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	86%	75%	57%	85%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	80%	67%	58%	73%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	59%	53%	61%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	91%	77%	63%	89%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	69%	62%	84%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	59%	51%	73%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	86%	72%	53%	82%	69%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	144 (0)	158 (0)	155 (0)	188 (0)	176 (0)	180 (0)	1001 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (3)	5 (13)	6 (15)	6 (8)	3 (14)	2 (8)	24 (61)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	1 (1)	0 (1)	2 (1)	2 (0)	0 (0)	7 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (1)	1 (1)	5 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	8 (10)	9 (12)	18 (23)

### 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
03	2019	88%	78%	10%	58%	30%
	2018	83%	78%	5%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%
	2018	82%	74%	8%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	83%	76%	7%	56%	27%
	2018	82%	73%	9%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	82%	6%	62%	26%
	2018	83%	80%	3%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	95%	82%	13%	64%	31%
	2018	92%	83%	9%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	89%	80%	9%	60%	29%
	2018	90%	79%	11%	61%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	85%	73%	12%	53%	32%
	2018	87%	73%	14%	55%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

**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	63	67	69	73	71	66	50				

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
ASN	89	85		94	92						
HSP	85	75		82	81	90					
MUL	86	71		91	86						
WHT	86	80	74	91	82	72	86				
FRL	79	78	75	82	73	67	68				
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				
MUL	94	50		88	100						
WHT	85	73	58	89	84	71	84				
FRL	75	61	56	84	73	65	57				

**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	82
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	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
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	90
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	83
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	84
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	82
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	75
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.**

The math learning gains of the lowest quartile dropped 2% from 77 to 75 and our Science achievement dropped from 88 to 86. Major resources were committed to ELA lowest quartile students which may have contributed to the slight drop in Math learning gains of the lowest quartile.

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

The Math learning gains of the lowest quartile and the science achievement both dropped by 2 points.

**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.**

Science scores were 33% higher than the state average and Math gains were 31% higher. A clear curriculum sequence in Science along with 4th and 5th grade subject rotations are potential factors in the Science gap. Math gains are also attributable to rotations and focus on PLC.

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

The ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile grew from 55 to 74. Major resources were committed to the Ramp Up for Reading camp for extra instruction for students in the lowest quartile.

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

The increase in level 1 FSA scores from 3rd grade (.53%) to 4th grade (4.55%) and 5th grade (5%) is a potential area of concern.

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

1. Math Learning Gains of lowest 25%
2. ELA Learning Gains of lowest 25%
3. PBIS

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Lowest quartile
<b>Rationale</b>	Our math lowest quartile dropped slightly from 77 to 75.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We want to increase lowest quartile learning gains from 75 to 77.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jesse Gates (jesse.gates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our after-school Ramp Up Camp targets math skills for our lower quartile students. Our two SAI tutors will also be scheduled to support our students with remediation and reteaching.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We have implemented a one-hour PLC Wednesday program to allow for teachers to work with our ILC to identify students in lowest quartile, identify specific weaknesses, and implement interventions in the classroom and in ramp-up camp.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify students in lowest quartile</li> <li>2. Identify weaknesses and implement interventions</li> <li>3. SAI tutors provide interventions</li> <li>4. Ramp up Camp</li> <li>5. Monitor plan with iReady and grade level formative data</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Nunes (jennifer.nunes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Lowest quartile
<b>Rationale</b>	The lowest quartile made significant improvement during 18-19 school year. To continue this momentum, we will continue focus on lowest quartile in reading.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase lowest quartile gains from 74 to 76.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jesse Gates (jesse.gates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	An after school camp along with SAI tutors will be used to provide interventions for students in lowest quartile. Weekly PLC meetings taking place on Wednesdays will be devoted to identifying students in lowest quartile, identifying specific weaknesses, and planning interventions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The ramp up camp will focus on student intervention for lowest quartile. SAI tutors will provide SIPP's interventions to students needing phonics instruction.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify lowest quartile</li> <li>2. Identify weaknesses and implement interventions</li> <li>3. Arrange ramp-up camp</li> <li>4. Monitor progress with iReady</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jennifer Nunes (jennifer.nunes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Work Hard, Be Kind, Be Awesome
<b>Rationale</b>	The school's motto this year is "Work Hard, Be Kind, Be Awesome!" The rationale is to build a culture at school where students are rewarded for hard work, kindness, and excellence.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The "Work Hard, Be Kind, Be Awesome!" and the Kindness crew will reduce the number of office referrals by 20%. We will have 7 Character Counts Banquets with parent invitation.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Lisa Brubaker (lisa.eckert-brubaker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Kindness crew will be used to provide incentives for proper behavior. We will have 7 Character Counts award banquets throughout the year with parent invitations. Guidance counselors will implement weekly Guidance lessons to grade levels.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The Kindness Crew rewards students for positive behavior and provides incentives for students. Inviting parents to character counts banquets will make this award more meaningful. Explicit instruction from Guidance counselors will help teach students how to behave and handle conflicts.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Now You Know Meetings held with grade levels to discuss school-wide expectations.</li> <li>2. Tier 1 classroom lessons provided by school counselors</li> <li>3. Kindness Crew implemented with fidelity by teachers and administrators</li> <li>4. Plan 7 Character Counts Banquets for classroom representatives throughout the year</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Rebecca Whaley (rebecca.whaley@stjohns.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).**