

St. Johns County School District

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary

260 CACIQUE DR, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Appelquist

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary

260 CACIQUE DR, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Hartley Elementary School will provide a safe and caring environment where every student's academic, emotional and social needs are nurtured. Parents, teachers, and staff work together to create a community in which children are inspired and empowered to attain their full potentials and embrace lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hartley Elementary School will grow a community of responsible, confident, caring and educated citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goricki, Paul	Principal	
Baker, Kasey	Assistant Principal	
Sloat, Michelle	Instructional Media	
McLellan, Sherry	Instructional Coach	
Kerly, Amber	SAC Member	
Kelso, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten, Team Leader
Williams, Darcie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Thomas, Wildalynn	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Hudson, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Samuels, Hank	Teacher, PreK	Team Leader
Linger, Debora	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader
Johnson, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	80	96	110	87	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	3	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	10	12	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	10	8	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	75%	57%	76%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	67%	58%	66%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	59%	53%	55%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	77%	63%	75%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	69%	62%	76%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	59%	51%	63%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	72%	53%	74%	69%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	96 (0)	80 (0)	96 (0)	110 (0)	87 (0)	126 (0)	595 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (7)	6 (9)	3 (10)	6 (12)	6 (7)	7 (4)	36 (49)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	0 (2)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (2)	2 (1)	7 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	14 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (8)	16 (15)	22 (23)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	78%	2%	58%	22%
	2018	81%	78%	3%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	77%	-10%	58%	9%
	2018	72%	74%	-2%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	71%	76%	-5%	56%	15%
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	82%	-7%	62%	13%
	2018	80%	80%	0%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	82%	-9%	64%	9%
	2018	77%	83%	-6%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	86%	80%	6%	60%	26%
	2018	85%	79%	6%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	80%	73%	7%	53%	27%
	2018	77%	73%	4%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	44	48	48	49	65	58	57				
BLK	29	60		38	69						
HSP	79	65		74	65						
MUL	63	36		75	73						
WHT	76	58	41	83	76	64	86				
FRL	59	52	37	65	69	65	70				
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	51	44	48	54	59	56	54				
BLK	33	43	40	62	50	40					
HSP	74	72		78	72		90				
MUL	73	80		86	94		82				
WHT	78	58	44	82	75	67	79				
FRL	60	59	43	69	66	55	66				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	37	55	50	44	68	61	38				
BLK	30	54		26	54	50					
HSP	86	83		86	100						
MUL	65	40		71	60						
WHT	80	67	55	79	77	67	79				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	62	57	46	62	66	51	56				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	71
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	62
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	69
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 Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

42 percent of students in the ELA Lowest Quartile demonstrated Learning Gains, eight percentile points below than the district goal of 50 percentile points and 11 points below the state average for ELA Lowest quartile gains of 53 percent. The ELA Lowest Quartile has historically been a low

performance area for Hartley Elementary School. Teachers are learning to better monitor students' progress with formative data and then differentiate their instruction to meet students' needs, particularly the needs of those students performing below their peers and below grade-level expectations.

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

The Fourth Grade ELA performance score of 67 was 5 points below the 2018 grade level score of 72 and 10 percentile points lower than the district average score. One factor contributing to this decline was teacher changes during the first semester which disrupted ELA instruction in two classrooms.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The Third Grade ELA achievement score of 80 percent was two percentile points higher than the district average of 78 percent and 22 percent higher than the state average of 53 percent. The third grade team is a group of veteran educators who last year embraced the professional learning communities initiative, a significant factor that positively influenced this gap.

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

The Fifth Grade Science achievement score of 80 percent was seven percentile points higher than the district average of 73 percent and 27 percent higher than the state average of 53 percent. Hartley's fifth grade classes are departmentalized, freeing the three science teachers from extra planning and allowing them to focus exclusively in the important science area.

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

Although ELA achievement among students in the Black subgroup fell four (4) percentile points, from 33 to 29 percent, ELA Learning Gains in the same subgroup increased by 17 points from the previous year, from 43 to 60 percent. Similarly, although Math achievement among students in the Black subgroup fell 24 percentile points, from 62 to 38 percent, Math Learning Gains in the same subgroup increased by 19 points from the previous year, from 50 to 69 percent.

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

1. ELA, Lowest Quartile
2. Math, Lowest Quartile
3. ELA, Achievement
4. ELA, Learning Gains
5. ELA and Math Achievement, Black Subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Students in the Lowest Quartile scored 42 in ELA Learning Gains, eight percentile points lower than the district goal of 50 points.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of a schoolwide focus on PLCs, a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction, and a particular focus on reading, by the end of the 2019-20 School Year, student achievement at the lowest quartile in ELA will increase from 42 to 44 percentile points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	As a result of a school-wide focus on professional learning communities, teachers will continue to prioritize team collaboration and move from independence to team interdependence. Teachers will share student data, instructional strategies, and problem-solve instructional challenges together.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Indicators of Success: regular collaborative team meetings that focus on common ELA units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership Team members will schedule weekly PLC meetings. 2. Grade-level and Resource PLC Teams will meet weekly. 3. PLCs will focus on common ELA units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data. 4. Administrators will attend PLC meetings and monitor progress. 5. Administrators will conduct mid-year Data Chats with each teacher, focused on those students in the lowest quartile and looking to problem-solve instructional challenges.
Person Responsible	Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Students in the Lowest Quartile scored 63 percent in Math Learning Gains, four points lower than the 2018 score of 67 percent.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of a schoolwide focus on PLCs, a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction, and a particular focus on math, by the end of the 2019-20 School Year, student achievement at the lowest quartile in Math will increase from 67 to 69 percentile points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	As a result of a school-wide focus on professional learning communities, teachers will continue to prioritize team collaboration and move from independence to interdependence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Indicators of Success: regular collaborative team meetings that focus on common math units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership Team members will schedule weekly PLC meetings. 2. Grade-Level and Resource Team PLC Teams will meet weekly. 3. PLCs will focus on common math units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data. 4. Administrators will attend PLC meetings and monitor progress. 5. The district Elementary Math Specialist will participate in and support teachers by attending one PLC meeting for each grade level team each month. 6. Administrators will conduct mid-year Data Chats with each teacher, focused on those students in the lowest quartile and looking to problem-solve instructional challenges.
Person Responsible	Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Positive School Culture
Rationale	During the 2018-19 School Year, 436 disciplinary referrals were submitted by teachers for student misbehavior. Many of the children referred have demonstrated gaps in social-emotional learning and their ability to interact in a positive, effective manner with adults and peers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of the Harmony program initiative, by the end of the 2019-20 School Year Hartley Elementary will reduce the number of disciplinary referrals by 15 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	After being trained on the Harmony program, teachers will facilitate weekly classroom meetings, where students will learn and practice appropriate social conventions and interpersonal relationships.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student conflict and disrespect of teachers results in lost instructional momentum and interruptions to student learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School counselor will train kindergarten and first grade teachers in the implementation of the Harmony Program. 2. The school counselor will provide training for small groups of students on Zones of Regulation. 3. The assistant principal and the MTSS Core will monitor disciplinary referrals and the perceived effectiveness of the Harmony Program by teachers. 4. Program modifications will be effected, as appropriate.
Person Responsible	Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Supporting the Parent Community

Working parents require affordable care for their children that is safe, enjoyable and convenient. During the 2019-20 School Year, Hartley will introduce a school-based extended day program that will provide all student participants with a well-supervised, enjoyable enrichment experience in a safe and familiar setting that feels "like home".

Our goal is to provide before- and after-school child care to 60-100 children of working parents. Fees will be similar to area programs and any profits will benefit Hartley Elementary students.