

St. Johns County School District

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary



2020-21 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	17
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: 6/25/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Linger, Debora	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader
Johnson, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Works, Angie	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade, Team Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/25/2018, Nicole Appelquist

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.*

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	78	100	108	85	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	9	2	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	1	0	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	7	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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

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	
	(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.

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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				
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				
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	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	69
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Forty-two percent of students in the ELA Lowest Quartile demonstrated learning gains, eight percentile points below the district goal of 50 percentile points, and 11 points below the state average of 53 percent for ELA Lowest Quartile gains. The ELA Lowest Quartile has historically been a low performance area for Hartley Elementary School. Teachers are learning to better monitor their students' progress with formative data and differentiate their instruction to meet students' needs, particularly the needs of students performing below their peers and below grade-level expectations. The experience of remote learning during the pandemic exacerbated the problem of low achievement among those in the lowest quartile, as a loss of rigor and active student participation during the fourth quarter resulted in lost learning.

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

Student ELA performance in general declined during the fourth quarter due to learning lost during the pandemic. Parents' unfamiliarity with Schoology, a reluctance among some students to view their parents as teachers, district limitations on curriculum to be taught and a widespread societal pain from the serious economic recession all were factors contributing to a decline in student performance.

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. Hartley's veteran team of third grade teachers embraced the professional learning communities initiative, a significant factor that positively influenced the 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 (2019) 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 were departmentalized, freeing the three science teachers from extra planning and allowing them to focus exclusively on the important science area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

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 (2018). 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Students in the Lowest Quartile scored 42 in ELA Learning Gains, eight percentile points lower than the district goal of 50 points.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of a schoolwide focus on professional learning communities, a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction and a particular focus on reading, by the the of the 2020-21 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 (PLCs), teachers will continue to prioritize team collaboration and continue to transition from independence to interdependence. Teachers will share student data, instructional strategies and problem-solve instructional challenges together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Indicators of Success: weekly collaborative team meetings that focus on common ELA units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership Team members will schedule weekly PLC meetings.
2. Grade-level and Resource PLC Teams will meet on a weekly basis.
3. PLCs will focus on common ELA units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.
4. Administrators will attend and monitor PLC meeting progress.
5. Administrators will conduct mid-year data chats with each each, focused on students in the lowest quartile and for the purpose of solving instructional challenges.

Person Responsible

Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus**

Math Learning Gains

Description and

Students in the Lowest Quartile scored 63 percent in Math Learning Gains, four points lower than the 2018 score of 67 percent. (2019)

Rationale:**Measurable Outcome:**

As a result of a school-wide focus on professional learning communities, a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction, and a particular focus on math, by the end of the 2020-21 School Year, student achievement at the lowest quartile in Math will increase from 67-69 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: weekly collaborative team meetings that focus on common math units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership Team members will schedule weekly PLC meetings.

Grade-Level and Resource Team PLC Teams will meet weekly.

PLCs will focus on common math units, learning progressions, common formative assessments and sharing student data.

Administrators will attend PLCs and monitor progress.

The district elementary math specialist will participate in and support teachers by attending one PLC meeting for each grade-level team each month.

Administrators will conduct mid-year data chats with each teacher, focusing on students in the lowest quartile and prioritizing problem-solving strategies.

Person**Responsible**

Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Hartley is a school that focuses on the needs, passions and aspirations of society's most important resource- its children. In this pandemic year, 75 percent of Hartley's students will be at school in safe cohorts, while the remaining 25 percent will be experiencing distance learning at home with a family member.

In an effort to respond to the social and emotional needs of families affected by the pandemic and the economic recession, the Hartley faculty will affirm its commitment of communication, cooperation, collaboration and support to the school community. In addition to encouraging volunteer and business-school partnerships and outreach to food-insecure families, Hartley will begin its second-year implementation of the Harmony program, in which teachers facilitate weekly classroom meetings, and students learn and practice appropriate social conventions and interpersonal relationships.

As a result of the Harmony program initiative, it is the school's goal to increase the social-emotional well-being of the students while decreasing the number of disciplinary referrals by 15 percent. Research demonstrates that student conflict and disrespect of teachers results in lost instructional momentum and interruptions to student learning. By providing Harmony program training for teachers and by diligently monitoring disciplinary referrals, Hartley teachers will support students in interacting in a positive, effective manner with adults and peers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.