

St. Johns County School District

Ponte Vedra High School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
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: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
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 (79%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (79%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	19%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Oberkehr, Fredrik	Principal	Dr. Oberkehr serves as the educational leader, responsible for managing the policies, regulations, and procedures to ensure that all students are educated in a safe environment.
O'Brian, Jeannine	Assistant Principal	Meeting with parents to discuss student behavior or educational concerns, evaluating teachers and learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed, hiring and training staff, and serves as LEA.
Sanzo, Steven	Assistant Principal	Meeting with parents to discuss student behavior or educational concerns, evaluating teachers and learning material to determine areas where improvement is needed, supervising grounds and facility maintenance, and serves as Lead admin on TAT.
Jasper, Haley	Assistant Principal	Meeting with parents to discuss student behavior or educational concerns, evaluating teachers and learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed, managing clubs and serving as Response to Intervention Coordinator, and maintaining logs for RtI meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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

74

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,898

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

27

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

21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502	461	475	464	1902
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	113	141	136	481
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	8	13	8	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	48	31	26	132
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	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	18	12	70
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	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	35	41	53	32	161

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	12	11	15	27	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

Thursday 7/29/2021

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	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	

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	458	473	455	452	1838
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	13	10	13	20	56
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	20	29	31	19	99
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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		

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				85%	74%	56%	87%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	60%	51%	69%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	50%	42%	68%	52%	44%
Math Achievement				90%	73%	51%	87%	66%	51%
Math Learning Gains				65%	58%	48%	64%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	55%	45%	65%	52%	45%
Science Achievement				93%	86%	68%	95%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				93%	88%	73%	97%	81%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	84%	75%	9%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	85%	74%	11%	53%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

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
2021					
2019	93%	87%	6%	67%	26%
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	94%	88%	6%	70%	24%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	79%	7%	61%	25%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

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

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

At this time, Achieve 3000 was used to Progress Monitor level 1 & 2 FSA ELA students. Data reported based on student proficiency (targeted Lexile Levels) during that level set window.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	32.9%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8.7%	20.8%	
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31.3%	37.7%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25%	23.5%	
Mathematics	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
Biology	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
US History	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.7%	28.1%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	48.3%	43.8%	
	English Language Learners	0%	N/A	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	36.8%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	12.5%	30.8%	
Mathematics	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
Biology	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
US History	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	41	53	54	45	34	36	54	69		97	17
ASN	98	81		82	35		95			100	81
BLK	63	60		85	60						
HSP	75	68	55	66	40	35	82	94		97	75
MUL	100	83		93	77		100				

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
WHT	82	66	59	84	51	59	91	91		98	68
FRL	50	38		67	38			91		97	38
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

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	74
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	743
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50

Students With Disabilities	
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	82
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	67
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	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	91
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	75
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	60
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?

The ELA Learning Gains went up from 59 to 67. ELA Achievement and Low 25% had a slight decrease. Math data has a downward trend across all three categories. Science, Social Studies & Graduation Rate held steady at 98. College and Career Acceleration took a 4 point drop. In regards to subgroup data, SWD showed a downward trend from a 58/B in 2019 to a 50/C in 2021.

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

Collectively, all three categories of Math show the greatest need for improvement, specifically the Learning Gains of the Low 25% with a 20 point decrease.

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

Contributing factors include the inability to conduct small group instruction regularly, the inability for students to access math tutors regularly, movement of students from brick & mortar platforms to digital platforms. Actions to be taken to address this need for improvement include Increase opportunities for small group and differentiated instruction, increased student acceptability to the math tutors, and a reduction in movement of students between platforms.

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

The most remarkable improvement from 2018-19 to 2020-21 occurred in the ELA Learning Gains, with an 8 point increase.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement in ELA Learning Gains would be the use of the ELA tutors as support in classrooms with the most need determined by student data, constant adjustment to the tutor schedule based on progress monitoring data, and the use of MTSS and the Literacy Leadership Team in the data analysis and progress monitoring.

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

Continued progress monitoring of students, use of tutors based on data, continued use of MTSS to address student needs in the Rtl process.

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.

Teachers at PVHS will have professional development opportunities related to data analysis and the PLC process through research in action during PLC data chats. Additionally, the ILC will provide targeted professional development in coaching cycles associated with the specific needs of individual PLCs and teachers/students.

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

PVHS will be taking a team of teachers to the PLC conference during the Summer of 2022. Tim Brown will be doing an in-service for staff related to PLC commitments and grading practices, and staff training and use of the Performance Matters data system will allow for data-driven instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PVHS will focus on overall ELA Achievement and the Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% in 9th and 10th grade based on the data trend from three years of data. In 2018 ELA Achievement was 87, dropped to 85 in 2019, and 82 in 2021. The ELA Learning Gains of the L25% have fallen from 68 in 2018 to 59 in 2019 and 58 in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal of PVHS is to increase the Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% by 2%, the data is currently above 50%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring data three times a year, data collected in the MTSS process, SAT/ACT scores, and FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies for increasing overall ELA Achievement and Learning Gains of the L25% will include progress monitoring level 1 and 2 students three times annually. Implementing a technology-based Lexile reading comprehension program for differentiated instruction based on student needs—the use of small group instruction, PLC data analysis, and ELA/Reading Tutors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring of students allows for progressive and continual data collection and analysis to enhance student achievement. Using the PLC process to analyze data will allow teams to collaborate and share resources to best support student learning. The use of tutors in high-need classes will provide an additional teacher in the classroom for small group instruction. These strategies are based on research by Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

Achieve 3000 LLevel Set Progress monitoring tool used three times annually of all level 1 and 2 FSA students in the ELA classroom.

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

EAL/Reading tutors in the standard ELA classes with the highest need of support based on student data from progress monitoring.

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

PLCs will use data analysis of common assessments to provide targeted reading intervention through small group differentiation in the ELA classroom.

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

Reading teachers will provide intensive reading instruction to students identified in need based on the district comprehensive reading plan and the MTSS process.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PVHS will focus on all three areas of Math learning in the Algebra 1 and Geometry classes based on the 2021 data. Math Achievement dropped from 90 to 82, Math Learning Gains dropped from 65 to 50, and Math Learning Gains of the L25 took the biggest drop from 76 to 50.
Measurable Outcome:	PVHS will increase the Math Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% to 60%. Math Achievement will increase by 2%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring data three times a year, data collected in the MTSS process, PSAT, SAT/ACT scores, and EOC scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Sanzo (steven.sanzo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group differentiated sessions with the Math Tutors and Math teachers based on data analysis by the PLC. The use of IXL, a progressive technology-based math program, allows for standards-based practice and progress monitoring. The use of Khan Academy remediation-based PSAT scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring of students allows for progressive and continual data collection and analysis to enhance student achievement. Using the PLC process to analyze data will allow teams to collaborate and share resources to best support student learning. The use of tutors in high-need classes will provide an additional teacher in the classroom for small group instruction. These strategies are based on research by Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Steven Sanzo (steven.sanzo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use of math tutors for practice and remediation in small group instruction.

Person Responsible Steven Sanzo (steven.sanzo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Math PLCs will conduct data analysis of common assessments to provide targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible Steven Sanzo (steven.sanzo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PVHS Administration will work to provide enhanced communication to parents based on the 2021 SAC Needs Assessment Survey.
Measurable Outcome:	Improved scores related to communication on the 2022 SAC Needs Assessment Survey Results
Monitoring:	PVHS SAC Members.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Hunter (angela.hunter@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Administration will host grade level Parent nights, Coffee chats with PTO, New Family nights, and New Student luncheons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing Administration communication with parents, PVHS will create a positive school climate.
Action Steps to Implement	
<i>No action steps were entered for this area of focus</i>	

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: PVHS will focus on SWD in both ELA and Math. The ELA Achievement went from 44 to 41 in 2021. The Math Achievement went from 58 to 45 in 2021. The total points for SWD had a drop from 58 in 2019 to 50 in 2021.

Measurable Outcome: The goal is to increase ELA to 50% and Math to 60%.

Monitoring: ELA will have progress monitoring by use of Achieve 3000, FSA, and SAT/ACT. Math will have progress monitoring using District Common Assessments, EOC, PAST, ACT/SAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeannine O'Brian (jeannine.obrian@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies will include Math & ELA tutors, small group instruction, REWARDS & Journeys form reading support, IXL, and Ascend Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: District intervention List as provided by MTSS and ESE.

Action Steps to Implement

Achieve 3000 progress monitoring used three times annually for ELA.
District Common Assessments are used three times annually for Math.

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

PLC teams will work with ESE Support Facilitation Teachers to analyze student-specific data and implement differentiated small group instruction.

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

District-based Access Point training.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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 the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org report, PVHS is ranked #51 out of 505 high schools statewide. Compared to all high schools statewide, it falls into the Very Low category with a reported 0.9 incidents per 100 students. PVHS will continue to work on quality relationships between staff and students to ensure a positive climate of acceptance.

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.

Areas where PVHS works to address positive school culture and environment include Sources of Strength, Link Crew, Character Counts!, Bud Burgers, Athletic Council, Student Government, Club Fair, PTO Parent Nights, New Kids on the Block Lunch, Family Night once a quarter, student-driven mental health fair, and Principal's Student Curriculum Council.

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

Stakeholders include students, parents, faculty, and staff. Many events are student-driven and student-led.