
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary

260 CACIQUE DR, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Appelquist, Nicole	Principal	
Reynolds, Brooke	Assistant Principal	
McLellan, Sherry	Instructional Coach	
Milillo, Kathryn	Behavior Specialist	
Kosobucki, Dalene	School Counselor	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Guiding Coalition as well as the SAC team reviewed the School Improvement plan. The SAC team is made up of family members as well as community members.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Student data will be reviewed during grade level Instructional Collaboration time. The Instructional Collaboration time is made up of Genral ed teachers, ESE teachers as well as members of the Leadership team.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	18	12	12	10	3	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	3	5	8	4	12	6	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	7	0	3	5	8	4	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	20	21	19	12	18	0	0	0	101

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	11	19	5	12	11	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	5	7	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	11	19	5	12	11	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	5	7	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	70	53	75	74	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				67			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			32		
Math Achievement*	80	73	59	83	50	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				81			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			58		
Science Achievement*	86	69	54	82	77	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	67			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	69			80			86					
SWD	38			51			67				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			50							2	
HSP	69			69			92				3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73			85			87				4	
FRL	58			69			74				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	67	40	83	81	70	82					
SWD	45	49	35	51	66	54	47					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	53			53								
HSP	69	64	50	72	73	83	69					
MUL	75	82		75	58		80					
PAC												
WHT	77	66	28	87	84	64	84					
FRL	63	61	38	75	72	61	68					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	50	32	80	74	58	67					
SWD	48	32	15	48	58	54	12					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			50								
HSP	52			67								
MUL	69			76								
PAC												
WHT	80	52	38	83	75	67	75					
FRL	65	32		74	71	60	55					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	72%	71%	1%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	76%	-8%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	72%	1%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	78%	4%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	79%	-6%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	87%	74%	13%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	70%	15%	51%	34%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

When reviewing the data the lowest performing grade level was 4th grade ELA and Math on progress monitoring 3.

Of the 4th grade ELA students, 68% of students scored a level 3, 4 or 5. This was 8% below the district percentage of level 3, 4 or 5.

Of the 4th grade Math students, 73% of students scored a level 3, 4 or 5. This was 6% below the district percentage of level 3, 4 or 5.

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

This was the first year of the FAST Cambium ELA and Math and we do not have data to compare to previous year.

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.

When comparing the school grade level percentage of level 3, 4 or 5s to the state percentage of level 3, 4 or 5s, grade 3 and grade 5 had the biggest gaps on Progress Monitoring 3.

82% of 3rd grade students scored a level 3, 4 or 5 on 3rd grade math. This percentage is 23% above the state percentage of 59% of students scoring a level 3, 4 or 5.

87% of 5th grade students scored a level 3, 4 or 5 on 3rd grade math. This percentage is 32% above the state percentage of 59% of students scoring a level 3, 4 or 5.

Grade levels began sharing data between teachers and shared students based on student needs. Teachers collaborated on strategies that helped students increase achievement.

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

There is no prior year data to show improvement as it was the first year of the FAST Cambium Reading and Math progress monitoring.

Teachers began planning as a team and sharing students for remediation and enrichment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern on the EWS dashboard is the number of students absent 10% more of the school year. 55 students missed 10% or more school days.

As a Guiding Coalition we will review the data and brainstorm ideas for improvement in attendance.

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

The highest priorities of Hartley is to continue relationship building with students, continue the PLC process to increase student achievement, and work towards PBIS model school status.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hartley is beginning the second year of implementing the PLC process with Instructional Collaboration time for teacher planning and Hawks Learning Time for students to receive enrichment and remediation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will meet as a team and focus on essential standards and student data. They will collaborate when reviewing the data to provide instruction, remediation and enrichment that is data driven. Instructional Collaboration Teams will intentionally share students that will result in an increase in achievement for all students.

Monitoring:

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

Administration as well as the ILC will monitor the teacher planning time during Instructional Collaboration time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use the four PLC questions as well as concepts learned from the PLC training in summers of 2023 and 2022.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Staff that attended the training are able to share with their peers and guide their instructional collaboration time.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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- Meet regularly in scheduled Instructional Collaboration groups.
- 2- Teams will ask for assistance when needed
- 3- Teams will share their students for enrichment and remediation as scheduled in the school's plan.

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

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hartley is working toward becoming a PBIS model school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Hartley will become a PBIS model school by the end of school year 2024-2025.

Monitoring:

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

The Hartley PBIS team will meet monthly as they work toward the goal of becoming a PBIS Model School.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Interventions and training will be used and provided from the PBIS district support person, Julie Hayden. Trainings are scheduled every other month so staff members are equipped with the knowledge necessary that will be used with students and other staff for a PBIS Model School.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School Culture of students because a concern in 2022-2023 and we would like to provide the staff with the tools to help students become successful academically as well as having good manners and behavior. We want our students to learn to become caring and kind humans.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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- Train staff through Professional Development every other month
- 2- Provide staff with the tools and resources needed
- 3- Educate and coach the students on how to be hawks that SOAR

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

By When: June 2025

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For Students with Disabilities, in 2022 ELA Achievement was 45% and Math Achievement was 51%, the lowest of the ESSA subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD ELA and Math students will increase achievement by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring data will be reviewed when completed by students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We would like to focus on increasing the student achievement for SWD students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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- Schedule intentional time with ESE students
- 2- Implement grade level paras to provide more classroom support.

Person Responsible: Brooke Reynolds (brooke.reynolds@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Transformational Leadership Goal: Teacher Feedback and Walk Throughs

Measurable Outcome:

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

Administration will provide each teacher constructive feedback to improve instruction through iObservation and Reading Walkthroughs.

Monitoring:

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

Feedback will be monitored through the EEE tool and Reading Walkthrough tool

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 at least one constructive feedback comment per teacher in iObservation and Reading Walkthrough Tool

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

By When: March 2024