**St. Johns County School District**

# W. Douglas Hartley Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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** <br> (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** <br> (per MSID File) | Elementary School <br> PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** <br> (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** <br> (as reported on Survey 3) | 44% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) <br> (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities <br> Black/African American Students <br> Hispanic Students <br> White Students <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (67%) <br><br> 2017-18: A (69%) <br><br> 2016-17: A (69%) <br><br> 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

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 44% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: A (69%)<br>2016-17: A (69%)<br>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 Description and Rationale:** | Math Learning Gains<br>Students in the Lowest Quartile scored 63 percent in Math Learning Gains, four points lower than the 2018 score of 67 percent. (2019) |
| **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.