Palm Valley Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm Valley Academy

700 BOBCAT LN, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

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

Demographics

Principal: Zach Strom

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	7%
2020-21 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 (72%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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

Palm Valley Academy

700 BOBCAT LN, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	6%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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.

At Palm Valley Academy we will:
Pursue Excellence
Value All
Achieve Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building Purposeful Leaders Where Everyone Shines Through Achievement

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reichenberg, Joy	Principal	Oversees: Instructional & Operational Leadership School Budget Parent & Community Communication Faculty & Support Staffing School Improvement Plan Professional Development Teacher Evaluation Support Staff Evaluation Data Analysis
Strom, Zach	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule 3rd-5th Grades Operations Recess/Resource/Lunch Schedules Transitions/Arrival/Dismissal Procedures ESE support/ IEPs Supervision of Paraprofessionals Teacher Evaluations
Slocum , D'Niessa	Assistant Principal	MTSS IEPs Extended Day Teacher Evaluations Middle school - 6th-8th Grades
Green, Brian	Assistant Principal	K-2nd grades safety drills IEPs 504s Duty schedules Textbooks PBIS
Miller, Amie	Instructional Coach	MTSS Professional Development Instructional support Curriculum support Spelling Bee Tropicana Speech
Braddock, Blake	SAC Member	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Zach Strom

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.*

3

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

108

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,560

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

54

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	260	274	259	257	265	242	253	241	246	0	0	0	0	2297
Attendance below 90 percent	16	8	5	4	11	11	22	25	32	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	2	7	7	12	16	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	14	9	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	0	3	0	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	24

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	3	7	11	16	5	4	7	7	5	0	0	0	0	65
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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	

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	

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				84%	84%	61%		72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	67%	59%		62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	61%	54%		62%	52%
Math Achievement				89%	88%	62%		76%	61%
Math Learning Gains				72%	71%	59%		65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	66%	52%		68%	52%
Science Achievement				75%	77%	56%		73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					95%	78%		85%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	77%	3%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	76%	7%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2021					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	72%	-72%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	93%	82%	11%	62%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	80%	0%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
06	2021					
	2019	91%	74%	17%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	73%	73%	0%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	79%	-79%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready data.
Fall = percent of students Early on Grade Level or above.
Winter = percent of students Mid On Grade Level or above.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	52	54	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	40	44	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	46	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	37	31	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	59	59	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	22	21	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	46	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33	21	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80	64	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	50	26	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	30	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	11	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	50	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	32	23	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	32	7	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	51	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	35	18	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67	39	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	35	20	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	47	42	35	52	42	36	46	59			
ELL	79			83							
ASN	91	76		100	89		90	100	96		
HSP	79	69	53	81	58	47	79	93	64		
MUL	82	75		80	54		59		79		
WHT	81	64	51	86	63	56	78	89	79		
FRL	76	50		69	45		69				
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	57	54	53	60	47	40	50				
ASN	92	88		100	90						
HSP	86	75		90	75		88				

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	87	77		97	86						
WHT	83	61	57	88	68	58	72				
FRL	57	59		75	61	50					
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	81
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	92
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	69
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	72
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	72
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

This year's data regresses in all areas except for Science Achievement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The areas for greatest need of improvement are the learning gains of the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

With the unique learning environments of the end of SY 2020 and throughout SY 2020-2021, students were subject to a variety of events that included sometimes participating in virtual learning, or having to quarantine throughout the year and having to switch learning platforms. Some of the hardest hit areas were targeted interventions (which include our lowest quartile of struggling learners), and resulted in some loss of gains in those subcategories.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our overall Science Achievement showed an increase of 3% improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We had a strong team of teachers in both 5th and 8th grades that worked through the PLC process to ensure that they were providing consistent instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We have experienced a number of changes to our school population just this school year. We lost a large portion of our student population to a new school that opened in the nearby area. This, combined with an influx of new students/ growth from all around the country begs for us to take a look at the makeup of our lowest quartile, and ensure we are targeting the correct students.
We will utilize strategies such as the PLC process to analyze student data, problem-solving at the MTSS Core team, Elementary Intervention Block, and Wednesday schedule for Middle School to provide opportunities for re-teaching and small groups.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

During allotted PLC times, Administration and Instructional Coach will collaborate and work with teachers on data analysis strategies. District Curriculum Team will provide PD on new standards and new curriculum throughout the year. ILC will provide needed PD on research-based interventions as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The master schedule will continue to be built with intervention and remediation in mind. Intervention programs will be renewed annually, and leadership will continue to pursue development opportunities in best practices to bring to teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although our goal was to increase our student achievement in the lowest quartile by 4% in 2020, special circumstances intervened and schools faced a number of unexpected challenges due to the pandemic. While overall ELA achievement only regressed by 3% and overall learning gains increased by 1%, the learning gains of the lowest quartile regressed 8%.
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable outcome for Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA (3rd – 8th Grades): PVA will raise the percentage of students performing in the lowest quartile making learning gains on the FSA by 4%. Current performance is at 52% in the lowest quartile in the middle grades. Measurable outcome for Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math (K-2nd Grades): PVA will raise the overall proficiency level on iReady in K-2 students by 4%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur through iReady benchmark assessments at 3 times throughout the year, as well as ultimately through FSA results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS/RtI interventions using research-based programs an implemented during a consistent intervention block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing targeted interventions based on specific student data in a consistent manner will provide specific results.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly MTSS/ Core meeting to problem solve and update student data.

Person Responsible	D'Niessa Slocum (dniessa.slocum@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Weekly grade level PLC meetings to identify students in need based on data in real time.

Person Responsible	Zach Strom (zachary.strom@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Utilization of intervention block in elementary schedule and Wednesdays in middle school schedule to provide opportunities for re-teaching/small groups.

Person Responsible	Amie Miller (amie.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although our goal was to increase our student achievement in the lowest quartile by 4% in 2020, special circumstances intervened and schools faced a number of unexpected challenges due to the pandemic. While overall Math achievement only regressed by 3%, the overall learning gains regressed by 8%, and the learning gains of the lowest quartile regressed 6%.
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable outcome for Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math (3rd – 8th Grades): PVA will raise the percentage of students performing in the lowest quartile making learning gains on the FSA by 4%. Current performance is at 55% in the lowest quartile in the middle grades. Measurable outcome for Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math (K-2nd Grades): PVA will raise the overall proficiency level on iReady in K-2 students by 4%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur through iReady benchmark assessments at 3 times throughout the year, as well as ultimately through FSA results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS/RtI interventions using research-based programs an implemented during a consistent intervention block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing targeted interventions based on specific student data in a consistent manner will provide specific results.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly MTSS/ Core meeting to problem solve and update student data.

Person Responsible	D'Niessa Slocum (dniessa.slocum@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Weekly grade level PLC meetings to identify students in need based on data in real time.

Person Responsible	Zach Strom (zachary.strom@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Utilization of intervention block in elementary schedule and Wednesdays in middle school schedule to provide opportunities for re-teaching/small groups.

Person Responsible	Amie Miller (amie.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PVA will continue to implement PBIS through Capturing Kids' Hearts and Character Counts programs. These programs have been in place since the opening of PVA 4 years ago, and are the foundation for the culture of the school.
Measurable Outcome:	All teachers and staff at PVA will be given the opportunity to be trained in PBIS policies and procedures. PVA will continue to implement Live School, a web based resource, to monitor our Positive Behavior Support Structures.
Monitoring:	Visible artifacts of PBIS programs, reduced number of office referrals due to behavior concerns.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Green (brian.green@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of PBIS strategies to include points, rewards, and other positive motivators. Continued use of Character Counts and Capturing Kids Hearts within the school day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS is a multi-tiered, evidence-based model that seeks to support and enhance both academic and behavioral outcomes for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase opportunities for students to earn both individual and "house" rewards.

Person Responsible	Brian Green (brian.green@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Provide opportunities for PD for teachers and staff to learn more about PBIS and how to implement the Live School rewards program.

Person Responsible	Brian Green (brian.green@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our lowest performing subgroup in 2020-2021 school data was our Students with Disabilities. We need to re-assess how we are working with these students and make adjustments where needed.
Measurable Outcome:	Using the PLC process, ESE teachers will spend that designated time to collaborate on high yield strategies to increase the achievement levels of SWD.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur both on formative assessments, iReady benchmark assessments, and ultimately on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zach Strom (zachary.strom@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC meetings will be conducted using the 4 critical questions of the PLC process. ESE teachers will collaborate with administration and instructional coach to determine best practices to administer interventions to SWD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs allow educators opportunities to directly improve teaching and learning, build stronger relationships between team members, help teachers stay on top of new research and emerging technology tools for the classroom, and help teachers reflect on ideas.

Action Steps to Implement

Specific time will be placed on the master schedule to give ESE teachers time for PLC collaboration.

Person Responsible	Zach Strom (zachary.strom@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

PD in best practices and new strategies will be brought to PLC meetings and modeled by the ILC.

Person Responsible	Amie Miller (amie.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to data provided from the site above, when comparing discipline data of PVA to discipline data across the state, PVA is ranked #51 out of 313 similar schools statewide. In the area of violent incidents, the ranking is Low. In the area of property incidents, the ranking is Very Low, and in the area of drug/public order incidents, the ranking is Low.
PVA will continue to use positive behavior supports to promote good choices among all of our students.
Administration and the Dean will meet regularly to discuss discipline occurrences and trends. They will problem solve to intervene as necessary.

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.

Building upon the foundation set forward in the opening of PVA in 2018, we continue to be intentional in our efforts to build a positive school culture and learning environment. Through building relationships with our families and community through our PTO and SAC, we can help parents have an opportunity to collaborate in the learning process.
Our formal programs that we use to achieve this are PBIS, Capturing Kids' Hears, and Character Counts.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Stakeholders include students, teachers, staff, parents, community members. The school mission statement (which was comprised by faculty, staff and community members) of "We will Pursue excellence, we will Value all, we will Achieve success. We are PVA!" emphasizes a culture of collaboration, high achievement and intrinsic value for all.