Ponte Vedra High School

2020-21 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/

Demographics

Principal: Fredrik Oberkehr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
2019-20 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%)
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 2/16/2021.

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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	2%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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.

Empowering Every Learner to Develop Good Character and Achieve Success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As part of developing a new mission statement in 2019-2020, PVHS is now in the process of developing relevant vision commitment statements and associated action plans.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 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 (PLC). Administrators perform classroom observations and schedule meetings with teachers to provide constructive feedback. 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	
Ashenfelder, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Burkert, Daniel	Registrar	
Beech, Bud	Dean	
Stanton, Tom	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Fredrik Oberkehr

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
78

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).	

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	458	473	455	452	1838
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	36	44	79	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	13	20	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	29	31	20	101
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	29	31	19	99
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	7	9	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	6	9	38

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	15	22	25	31	93

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	43	81	94	156	374
One or more suspensions	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	5	20	7	4	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	43	81	94	156	374
One or more suspensions	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	5	20	7	4	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	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%
	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%
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

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
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
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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0
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%	0

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 categories falling at 59%. There was a 10% drop for ELA Learning Gains between 2019 and 2018, and a 9% drop for ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% between 20019 and 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 most significant 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 most significant gap, when compared to the state, is Math Achievement at 90% compared to the state average of 51%. The data 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 2019, with an 11% increase to 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?

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. Keeping the community of PVHS safe during the Covid-19 pandemic.
2. Addressing the challenges of distance learning.
3. Implementation of social-emotional instructional resources to address the social-emotional needs of the students of PVHS.
4. Increase ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% by 2% to 61% in the 2020-2021 school year.
5. Increase Math Learning Gains by 2% to 67% in the 2020-2021 school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of Lowest 25% by 2% to 61% in the 2019-2020 school year. The Needs Assessment Data indicated a downward trend of 10% during the 2018-2019 school year in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	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@stjohs.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. Additionally, the implementation of a technology-based Lexile reading comprehension program for differentiated instruction based on student needs.
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 Steps to Implement

Achieve 3000 Level Set progress monitoring tool-2 times annually of all level 1 and level 2 students in the ELA classroom.

Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohs.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of Study Island reading comprehension platform in the 10th grade ELA Classroom based on student needs.

Person Responsible	Angela Hunter (angela.hunter@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of ELA/Reading tutor for differentiated instruction in ELA classroom based on student needs.

Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Math Learning Gains by 2% to 67% in the 2019-2020 school year. The Needs Assessment Data indicated an upward trend of 1% during the 2018-2019 school year in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	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@stjohs.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. Additionally, the implementation of differentiated instruction provided by math tutors based on formal and informal standards-based assessments to meet individual student needs.
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 Steps to Implement

Use of technology-based math remediation IXL program in the math classrooms based on student need.

Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohs.k12.fl.us)

Use of math tutors for practice and remediation based on student need.

Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use of technology-based math remediation Algebra Nation program in the Algebra 1 classroom based on student needs.

Person Responsible	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohs.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The implementation of Social Emotional Learning Standards was determined to be a focus based on the 2019 Florida Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Florida Legislation, and the impact of COVID-19 on the current mental and emotional health of staff and students at PVHS.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase student engagement with student support services such as Sources of Strength, Link Crew, guidance counselor resources to reduce emotional distress. To decrease in reports of student depression, anxiety (i.e., COVID related/other), stress, or social withdrawal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of the new district Social-Emotional Learning standards in content area classrooms, full rollout of the Sources of Strength program, and guidance counselor meetings with students to help recognize and manage emotions, identify how to establish healthy relationships, set positive goals, make responsible decisions, and help with problem-solving.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above-stated strategies were selected because they will help foster positive classrooms and school environments that will result in an increase in academic performance while decreasing emotional distress and anxiety.

Action Steps to Implement	
Commitment from administration to ensure the successful rollout of social-emotional learning standards and sources of strength program.	
Person Responsible	Fredrik Oberkehr (fredrik.oberkehr@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Provide professional development for staff on the district social-emotional learning standards.	
Person Responsible	Angela Hunter (angela.hunter@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Needs Assessment.	
Person Responsible	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Utilization of existing supports and resources to prevent overlap.	
Person Responsible	Guy Harris (guy.harris@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The focus of the Culture and Environment will help address the concerns related to 12th-grade attendance concerns from the EWS report.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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 needs are met. The measurable outcome of this goal will be participating 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.

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. Also, recognition of this achievement will be advertised and distributed campus-wide. The rationale for selecting this strategy is based on the district-wide Character Counts program.

Action Steps:
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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.