

St. Johns County School District

# W. Douglas Hartley Elementary



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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: 7/1/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (69%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

### 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.

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 life long 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

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
Appelquist, Nicole	Principal	
Reynolds, Brooke	Assistant Principal	
Kosobucki, Dalene	School Counselor	
McLellan, Sherry	Instructional Coach	
Milillo, Kathryn	Other	
Kerly, Amber	Other	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Nicole Appelquist

**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.*

2

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

45

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

635

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

4

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

9

### 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	116	110	109	81	106	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628
Attendance below 90 percent	29	11	19	5	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	5	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	5	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

Sunday 9/4/2022

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	94	98	74	97	107	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	6	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	7	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	2	2	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	94	98	74	97	107	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	6	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	7	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	2	2	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	74%	56%				72%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						58%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						42%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	83%	50%	50%				79%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	81%						75%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						63%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	77%	59%				81%	72%	53%

### 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	80%	78%	2%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	77%	-10%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	71%	76%	-5%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	75%	82%	-7%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	82%	-9%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	80%	6%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	80%	73%	7%	53%	27%
Cohort Comparison						

### 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	45	49	35	51	66	54	47				
BLK	53			53							
HSP	69	64	50	72	73	83	69				
MUL	75	82		75	58		80				
WHT	77	66	28	87	84	64	84				
FRL	63	61	38	75	72	61	68				

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	48	32	15	48	58	54	12				
BLK	38			50							
HSP	52			67							
MUL	69			76							
WHT	80	52	38	83	75	67	75				
FRL	65	32		74	71	60	55				
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				

### 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	71
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	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	53
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	69
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	74
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	70
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	63
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?

Subgroup data comparing 2021 to 2022 :

The White subgroup ELA achievement dropped from 80% to 77%.

The Students with Disabilities subgroup ELA achievement dropped from 48% to 45%.

The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup ELA achievement dropped from 65% to 63%.

The Multiracial subgroup Math achievement dropped from 76% to 75%.

ELA Grade level Data when reviewing the percentage of students scoring a Level 3, 4 or 5 comparing 2021 to 2022::

3rd grade increased in ELA achievement 1%.

3rd grade scored higher than the district average by 3% in ELA Achievement.

4th grade decreased in ELA achievement 4%.

4th grade scored lower than the district average by 7% in ELA Achievement.

5th grade increased 10% in ELA achievement from .

5th grade scored higher than the district average by 4% in ELA Achievement.

Math Grade level Data when reviewing the percentage of students scoring a Level 3, 4 or 5 from 2021 to 2022:

3rd grade increased in Math achievement 2%.

3rd grade scored lower than the district average by 6% in Math Achievement.

4th grade increased in Math achievement 2%.

4th grade scored higher than the district average by 3% in Math Achievement.

5th grade increased 9% in Math achievement.

5th grade scored higher than the district average by 12% in Math Achievement.

When reviewing schoolwide data, ELA achievement remained the same at 75% when comparing 2021 and 2022. Math achievement increased from 80% to 83% from 2021 to 2022. Science achievement increased from 67% to 82%.

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

The greatest need for improvement is the 4th grade ELA achievement and the subgroups of white, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged.

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

We have implemented the PLC process at Hartley after attending professional development in June 2022. Grades levels are working together and looking at their data to focus on how to help all students be successful.

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

The grade level with the most improvement is 5th grade ELA and Math.

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

5th grade teachers utilize small group instruction and departmentalize so they can focus on ELA or math.

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

Within the PLC process, teachers will work together in the Hawk Learning Together (HLT) time to create activities for enrichment groups for students that need to have their learning accelerated.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will receive professional development on a new district purchased software, Lexia Core 5.

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

Teachers will work weekly within their HLTs to improve their instruction and reach the needs of all children.

### **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.

3rd grade and 5th grade increased in ELA achievement while 4th grade decreased.  
We would like for all students to increase in overall ELA achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will review the progress monitoring tools and would like all students to increase by 2% between Progress Monitoring 1 and Progress Monitoring 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

Using the new state Progress monitoring tool, we will compare the three windows of progress monitoring scores.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sherry McLellan (sherry.jackson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Teachers will present critical content in small amounts as they progress through the unit plans with their team. They will meet in HLT teams and review formative assessments from their essential standards decided on as a HLT, to find where remediation or enrichment needs to take place.  
As teachers review the learning targets, they will question students, provide feedback and review formative assessments to check for understanding.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

These strategies are used in the classroom and data will be shared with their grade level peers during their HLT weekly. The ILC is available for coaching on the evidence-based strategies.

**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.

1. Grade level HLTs will decide on essential ELA standards.
2. HLTs will share their decided upon formative data and share instructional strategies to help all students be successful.
3. Grade level HLTs will submit weekly HLT notes.

**Person Responsible**

Nicole Appelquist (nicole.appelquist@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.

As a Leadership team, Literacy Walkthrough data will be reviewed as well as check ins on the HLT process at the monthly meetings.

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

Review collected Reading Walkthrough data when meeting as an Instructional Leadership Team. Data will be added monthly and presented to the Instructional Leadership Team. Through reviewing the data the team should see an increase in the use of district resources during the ELA block in comparison to 2021-2022..

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

Area of focus will be monitored through the Instructional Leadership Team.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Appelquist (nicole.appelquist@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Through using the district resources and pacing guide students will benefit from whole group instruction as well as small group instruction.

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

Small group instruction has proved to be effective as teachers can differentiate to students at different levels in their classroom.

### 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.

1. Keep ongoing data from Literacy Walkthroughs
2. Support teachers and provide PD if data collected shows a need.

**Person Responsible**

Sherry McLellan (sherry.jackson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to student behavior expectations

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** "All students have a right to learn and enjoy school without interference."  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Our focus at Hartley is to keep everyone safe while focusing on student behaviors.

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

Students have expectations at Hartley when in hallways and in class.

H- Hands, feet, and objects to yourself

A- Always listen and follow directions

W- Wait for permission to speak or leave your seat

K- Kind and respectful to ALL

Students earn compliments in the hallways based on the expectations. The number of compliments earned allows them to earn a class reward they decide on together.

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

The area of focus will be measured by the decrease in the amount of referrals in 2022-2023 when comparing to 2021-2022.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kathryn Milillo (kathryn.young@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Not an evidence based strategy but compliance to the school expectations.

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

Students walking the hallway have not previously had expectations. The hallway expectations will eliminate hallway behaviors.

#### 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.

1. Each class decides on the word they would like to spell based on the number of hallway compliments.
2. Each class decides what they are working toward to earn for their compliments.
3. Number of referrals will be monitored at the end of the first semester and at the end of the second semester.

**Person Responsible**

Kathryn Milillo (kathryn.young@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#4. 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.**

The ELA achievement percentage for 2021-2022 dropped 3% from 2020-2021.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

After reviewing the Progress monitoring 1 and Progress Monitoring 3 we should see a 2% increase among the students with disabilities in ELA achievement.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area of focus will be monitored using the new state progress monitoring model.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Students with Disabilities (SWD) will receive small group instruction from their ESE teacher that is aligned with their grade level classroom.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

SWD are provided additional instruction to help close the achievement gap.

**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.

1. Provide students ELA small group instruction by the gen ed teacher and the ESE teacher
2. Monitor student data through HLT team meetings

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

**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.**

Hartley is building a positive school culture through Character Counts. Teachers continue to greet their students as they enter class and students have a class job that changes weekly or monthly. Students feel valued and a part of the school.

Based on hallways compliments given to the class, the class can earn compliments working toward a class decided upon reward.

Character Counts assemblies are held monthly where classrooms can nominate a student in their class. The student's picture is displayed outside the main office to celebrate their achievement.

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

This year we continued the Heartley Crew, a committee of staff members, that have planned a monthly activity for staff to boost morale. These activities will include, a coffee cart, a BBQ lunch, staff treats in their mailbox, breakfast for staff, etc.

Families can complete yearly surveys that are created by the SAC committee to provide feedback to make Hartley a better place to work and learn.