

St. Johns County School District

Palm Valley Academy



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	7%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: 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	N/A
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	7%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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 Elementary School Oversight Operations Recess/Resource/Lunch Schedules Transitions/Arrival/Dismissal Procedures ESE support/ IEPs Supervision of Paraprofessionals Teacher Evaluations
Slocum , D'Niessa	Assistant Principal	Middle School Oversight IEPs Extended Day Teacher Evaluations Paraprofessional Support Testing Support
Green, Brian	Assistant Principal	safety drills MTSS 504s Duty schedules Textbooks PBIS
Velsor, Ryan	Dean	PBIS Discipline Instructional Support SAC oversight

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Zach Strom

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,490

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	168	178	178	170	139	149	154	157	264	0	0	0	0	1557
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	0	6	8	8	12	17	51	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	2	5	9	12	19	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	13	21	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 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	2	10	9	12	12	16	16	0	0	0	0	77

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	0	2	0	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	30

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/30/2022

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	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	

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	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	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	65
Students retained two or more times		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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	75%	55%				84%	84%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						65%	67%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						60%	61%	54%
Math Achievement	88%	45%	42%				89%	88%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%						72%	71%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						61%	66%	52%
Science Achievement	77%	81%	54%				75%	77%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	71%	59%					95%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	77%	3%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	83%	76%	7%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	72%	-72%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	93%	82%	11%	62%	31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	80%	80%	0%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
06	2022					
	2019	91%	74%	17%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	73%	73%	0%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	79%	-79%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	48	48	31	54	61	51	43	57	58		
ELL	77			85							
ASN	92	69		100	86		100		94		
HSP	71	52	33	83	79	70	77	82	83		
MUL	86	64		89	77		80				
WHT	80	58	46	88	75	69	77	91	71		
FRL	65	40	32	67	57	60	55	77			
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				
MUL	87	77		97	86						
WHT	83	61	57	88	68	58	72				

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
FRL	57	59		75	61	50					

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	657
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	81
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	90
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
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	79
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	73
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We see an increase in the learning gains of our lowest quartile in Math, some decrease/regress in the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. Our overall proficiency in ELA and Math is comparable to

our district, and higher than state averages. Our ELA performance in third grade was the highest proficiency in the county at 90%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area for greatest need of improvement is the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. Specifically our seventh grade cohort of lowest quartile - which showed the lowest performance in ELA, having only 23% of those students performing at proficiency.

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

Some of the factors contributing to this need for improvement are the student population going through myriad changes since the school opened four years ago. Our growth has finally stabilized and we are evenly distributed throughout most of the grade levels in both elementary and middle school. We have also made some very strategic moves and hires with our staff in these areas of needed improvement. We will also provide targeted training in research-based interventions to help provide an increase in student performance of our learners with the highest academic needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

FSA Math assessments across the board showed good improvement. Formative data such as district-created Common Formative Assessments also showed student improvement.

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

We built PLC time directly into the master schedule. Teachers were given structures to work within to analyze student data and make informed instructional decisions.

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

Students will be exposed to grade level standards and work - no matter their current abilities and capabilities. Teachers will use instructional strategies such as cooperative learning, hands-on techniques, and even social-emotional learning to help students who struggle to be better able to achieve grade level work.

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.

We will bring in district specialists who are experts at learning strategies during our monthly early release PD opportunities. We will also make the best use of PLC time to incorporate some research and instruction on best practices on a much more personalized level by grade or content area.

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

Looking ahead to future planning, making informed decisions on personnel available and use thereof to maximize the potential for incorporating professional learning communities into our master schedule.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After looking at our holistic ELA data from FSA this year, there were some spots that were of obvious need. The most critical need is in the ELA proficiency of our lowest quartile. Our lowest quartile is made up of mostly SWD. As we drilled further into the data, there was a definite increase in the percentage of SWD making Level 1 and Level 2 on FSA the higher we looked into grade levels. In fact it was a steady increase, with its peak at 7th grade.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

English Language Arts (ELA): Increase our capacity in the proficiency of our lowest quartile by 15% (current performance is 44%). Increase proficiency in our general education student population to 85% (current performance is 79%).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring tool will be the new FAST testing. Because it happens at three benchmark timeframes throughout the school year, we will be able to properly monitor our progress and intervene as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers and administration will collaborate in Professional Learning Communities to share and analyze student data. They will target intentional instruction to the gaps found and share students among the grade level as needed to ensure that all students are receiving high levels of instruction and given opportunities to achieve high levels of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

By working through this process, teachers will not only identify learning problems of students, but also identify where instructional practices may need to be tweaked or re-written to better help students understand content.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Intentional hiring of new staff on our ESE team to replace several retiring and resigning teachers.

Person Responsible Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Configuring the master schedule to accommodate a daily intervention block of time where students will work with a variety of teachers to help work more efficiently with reteaching and remediation.

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

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

With our focus being on an even better implementation of the Professional Learning Community process, we are changing our approach with regards to team leaders. We are trying to build the capacity of our teachers in these roles to be the instructional leader of their team.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We want to see an increase in our overall ELA proficiency in both the general education population, as well as within the student population of our lowest quartile, through effective use of Professional Learning Communities within our school.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will happen through both formative and summative data collected throughout the year. Final outcomes will be measured by the third administration of FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative team leader meetings will occur monthly to update and monitor the practices happening at the grade level PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Starting at the top-down, administration and team leaders have been given the opportunity to attend PLC conferences, as well as worked through some professional development at the school level. We will take the knowledge obtained and disseminate the philosophy to instructional staff.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Selection of teachers who want to fulfill the role of team leader beyond that of planning and organizing. Using a specific questionnaire process, administration will interview teachers and build the team of leaders.

Person Responsible

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Administration will communicate the logistical and organizational pieces to all teachers in an effective manner and will use team leader meetings for building capacity in teacher leaders to better facilitate the PLC process.

Person Responsible

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

For the last three years, school-wide Math FSA data (3-8) has continued to show a positive upward trend in all three reporting areas. In 2022, 88% of our population earned a proficiency score of a level 3 or above, slightly down from 89% in 2020, but up 2% from 2021 (Math Achievement). School-wide Math Learning Gains increased 12% from 64% in 2021, to 76% this year. Additionally, it was those students in the third reporting category who demonstrated the most growth. It was our Math Bottom Quartile students who grew the most in 2022, with 70% posting Learning Gains, up 15% from the 2021 mark of 55%. If we maintain current trends in math, both in proficiency and growth, we will continue to maintain well above both district and state averages. However, when we dig deeper and study the three math reporting areas a little further, an increasingly concerning issue is discovered.

While Palm Valley Academy continues to be amongst the best scoring schools in the district and state, there continues to be a large group of students who are consistently falling well below their peers. While Math Achievement was an astounding 88% in 2022, our Students with Disabilities dropped 34% below that mark, with only 54% achieving proficiency. Similar comparisons are seen across all areas of Math as well, as they were 15% lower in Math Learning Gains with 76% and 19% behind in the Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. Unfortunately, this achievement gap has proven a constant since 2019, when scores yielded even larger deficits between SWDs achievement levels and those of their same age peers (-29%, -25%, -21% in the respective math reporting categories).

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The Students with Disabilities subgroup will yield a 15% growth rate in each of the three Math reporting categories, which will in-turn begin to close the achievement deficits in those categories between our SWDs and their same age peers.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

In order to monitor our progress towards our goal, inclusion teams of both gen. ed and ESE teachers will review quarterly data, including but not limited to grade level summatives and any FAST assessment outcomes (fall, winter, and spring) during our school-wide Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with a focus on instructional best practices and proven routines of the BEST State Standards for Math. Our PLCS meet for 70 mins weekly to disaggregate this data while also regularly reviewing data to plan accordingly during appropriate daily sessions (35 mins). Our focus is to increase the number of SWDs performing at grade level, while working consistently towards meeting their IEP specific goals. The implementation of instructional strategies is monitored during our classroom walkthroughs by academic coaches and administrators, followed by written and/or verbal feedback in a timely manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The following evidence-based strategies will be used to increase student performance in Math:

1. Acceleration/Remediation Strategies embedded in our general education curriculum in grades K-8 such as previewing and scaffolding instruction, providing differentiated assignments, provide extension of material, provide remediation as needed, and review concepts.
2. Assisting students in developing their attention to detail, as well as their own accountability and responsibility through goal setting, tracking, and self-reflection.
4. Exceptional Student Education (ESE)/Interventionists will collaborate with teachers to ensure that visuals, manipulatives, and other accommodations are consistently implemented in the general education classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The use of these varied high-yield strategies will result in higher math gains in our SWD.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Working with the ESE team, schedules will be built to allow for best inclusion practices in middle school, and to integrate ESE teachers into the intervention block in elementary school.

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

Administration and ESE team will meet regularly to monitor student progress and make best next-step decisions with regards to instruction.

Person Responsible Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our school has had consistent and significant growth over the past few years. This is the first year where we are pretty steady and even with regards to student numbers throughout the grade levels. Previous attempts at positive behavior and rewards have been well-intentioned, but spotty.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our school will participate in a holistic positive behavior system that is tailored to elementary and middle school students specifically, with an outcome of decreased student behavior issues.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress will be monitored through the use of the Live School app in elementary, and a punch card system in student planners in middle school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Velsor (ryan.velsor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students will be explicitly taught the pillars of character, will create social contracts within the classroom, and will be held to specific, schoolwide expectations of behavior throughout their school day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Having a consistent message of expectations and common language helps lower the confusion of students when they experience different settings within the school day.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The dean will visit all elementary grade level PLCs and describe the use of the Live School app and how to troubleshoot, invite parents, etc.

Person Responsible

Ryan Velsor (ryan.velsor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The dean will visit all middle school homerooms the first few weeks of school to establish behavior expectations and review rewards systems.

Person Responsible

Ryan Velsor (ryan.velsor@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Administration will collaborate with the dean and team leaders to help follow through with needed resources for rewards.

Person Responsible

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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.

Because our behavior and character programs have been so broad and often times confusing, we have put together a Positive Behavior Handbook containing the best practices from various programs and are approaching it as the PVA way.

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

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.