

St. Johns County School District

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary



2018-19 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 9 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

W. Douglas Hartley Elementary

260 CACIQUE DR, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
 (per MSID File)

Elementary School
 PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
 (As Reported on Survey 3)

46%

Primary Service Type
 (per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
 (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

21%

School Grades History

| Year Grade | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | A | A | A | A* |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Goricki, Paul | Principal |
| Baker, Kasey | Assistant Principal |
| Milillo, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 |
| Paul, Charlotte | Teacher, K-12 |
| Erickson, Michele | Teacher, K-12 |
| Sugrue, Shannon | Teacher, K-12 |
| Sloat, Michelle | Instructional Media |
| McLellan, Sherry | Instructional Coach |
| Harris, Jill | Teacher, K-12 |
| Pryor, Allison | Teacher, K-12 |
| Kerly, Amber | SAC Member |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

Hartley's School Leadership Team is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, instructional literacy coach and teacher leaders. The principal and assistant principal plan and deliver professional development, observe instruction and provide feedback, review teacher and student data, confer with parents and teachers and conduct intervention fidelity checks and behavior observations. The assistant principal develops schedules, helps teachers analyze student data, serves as the Local Education Authority supervising supports provided to Students with Disabilities, and acts as coordinator of

the MTSS Core Team. The ILC coordinates the MTSS team, coaches teachers, provides professional development and makes recommendations for interventions. She also facilitates the iReady testing and MTSS meetings. Teacher leaders attend monthly Leadership Team meetings that are an extension of the school's professional learning community. Teacher leaders analyze data to inform instruction and determine school progress towards identified goals. Members of the School Leadership Team provide turn-around training and support for their individual teams. All members participate in processes and protocols that are integrated with school improvement plan goals and strategies. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

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

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

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 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Date this data was collected
 Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

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

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

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

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

At Hartley Elementary, school-wide ELA Learning Gains fell from 66 to 59 percent during the 2017-18 School Year. Additionally, among the lowest 25th percentile, only 46 percent of students made learning gains, as compared to 55 percent the previous school year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Learning Gains of the Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the previous school year, falling nine percentage points, from 55 to 46 percent of the tested group. Two subgroups dropped even more significantly. ELA Learning Gains within the Black subgroup fell 11 points, from 54 to 43 percent, and Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities also dropped 11 points from 55 to 44 percent.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The largest gap between Hartley's achievement and the stage average were in the area of Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 Percentile. Hartley's score of 46 percent was two points lower than the state average of 48 percent. In every other data component, the performance of Hartley Elementary School students exceeded the state average by a range of 4 to 22 percentage points.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math Achievement increased by six (6) percentage points- from 75 to 81 percent- from the previous school year.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

Math instruction is an area of strength at Hartley Elementary School. A focus on number sense and knowledge of basic math facts contributed to these gains.

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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 75% | 72% | 56% | 76% | 74% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 59% | 55% | 66% | 64% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 50% | 48% | 55% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 81% | 77% | 62% | 75% | 75% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 75% | 67% | 59% | 76% | 69% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 58% | 47% | 63% | 60% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 77% | 68% | 55% | 74% | 69% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 (6) | 9 (10) | 10 (8) | 12 (7) | 7 (6) | 4 (6) | 49 (43) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (3) | 2 (6) | 1 (1) | 5 (11) |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (3) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (3) | 8 (12) | 15 (17) | 23 (32) |

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 | 2018 | 81% | 78% | 3% | 57% | 24% |
| | 2017 | 77% | 80% | -3% | 58% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 72% | 74% | -2% | 56% | 16% |
| | 2017 | 74% | 74% | 0% | 56% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 72% | 73% | -1% | 55% | 17% |
| | 2017 | 72% | 75% | -3% | 53% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 80% | 80% | 0% | 62% | 18% |
| | 2017 | 64% | 80% | -16% | 62% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 77% | 83% | -6% | 62% | 15% |
| | 2017 | 80% | 82% | -2% | 64% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 85% | 79% | 6% | 61% | 24% |
| | 2017 | 79% | 80% | -1% | 57% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 |
| WHT | 78 | 58 | 44 | 82 | 75 | 67 | 79 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 43 | 40 | 62 | 50 | 40 | | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 72 | | 78 | 72 | | 90 | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | 80 | | 86 | 94 | | 82 | | | | |
| SWD | 51 | 44 | 48 | 54 | 59 | 56 | 54 | | | | |
| 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 |
| WHT | 80 | 67 | 55 | 79 | 77 | 67 | 79 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 54 | | 26 | 54 | 50 | | | | | |
| HSP | 86 | 83 | | 86 | 100 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 40 | | 71 | 60 | | | | | | |
| SWD | 37 | 55 | 50 | 44 | 68 | 61 | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 57 | 46 | 62 | 66 | 51 | 56 | | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1 | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | ELA Learning Gains |
| Rationale | Schoolwide 2018 ELA Learning Gains fell seven (7) points, from 66 to 59 percent, as compared to 2017 FSA results. ELA Learning Gains for the Black subgroup fell 11 percentage points, from 54 to 43 percent, from the 2017 to 2018 testing period. ELA Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) dropped similarly, from 55 to 44 percent in that same one-year period. The decline in Learning Gains for these two subgroups was 16 and 15 percentage points less than the school-wide ELA Learning Gains. |
| Intended Outcome | As a result of school-wide focus on professional learning communities and a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and group instruction, by the end of the 2018-19 School Year, student ELA Learning Gains will increase from 59 to 61 percent overall, from 43 to 50 percent within the Black subgroup, and from 44 to 50 percent in the SWD subgroup. |
| Point Person | Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Grade-level teams will collaborate in professional learning communities to develop common formative assessments. Using those assessments, teachers will analyze student results and develop differentiated learning strategies for all students. Teachers will prioritize small-group instruction and participate in professional development related to best practice strategies for challenged readers. |
| Person Responsible | Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | Administration will require grade-level teams to submit weekly summaries of their collaborative activities, school leaders will focus on academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction and professional development will emphasize best-practice instructional strategies for challenged readers. |
| Person Responsible | Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Activity #2

Title ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 Percent

Rationale Among the lowest 25 percent of tested students, only 46 percent made learning gains, as compared to 55 percent the previous school year.

Intended 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 the lowest 25 percent of readers, by the end of the 2018-19 School Year ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 Percent will increase from 46 to 50 percent.

Point Person Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Grade-level teams will collaborate in professional learning communities to develop common formative assessments,. Using those assessments, teachers will analyze students results and develop differentiated learning strategies for all students. Teachers will prioritize small-group instruction and participate in professional development related to best practice strategies for challenged readers.

Person Responsible Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration will require grade-level teams to submit weekly summaries of their collaborative activities, school leaders will focus on academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction and professional development will emphasize best-practice strategies for challenged readers.

Person Responsible Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | ELA Achievement of the Black Subgroup |
| Rationale | Thirty-three (33) percent of the Black subgroup made satisfactory progress in the ELA Achievement component of the FSA, as compared to the schoolwide average of 75 percent, a significant difference of 42 percentage points. |
| Intended Outcome | As a result of a schoolwide focus on professional learning communities and a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group ELA instruction among African-American students, by the end of the 2018-19 School Year, ELA Achievement within the Black subgroup will increase by 17 points, from 33 to 50 percent. |
| Point Person | Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Action Step

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Description | Grade-level teams will collaborate in professional learning communities to identify specific areas of academic deficiency in the ELA area among individual African-American students, and using that data, develop differentiated learning strategies for those children. Teachers will prioritize small-group instruction and participate in professional development related to best practice strategies for challenged minority readers. |
| Person Responsible | Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Description | Administration will require grade-level teams to submit weekly summaries of their collaborative activities, school leaders will focus on academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction and professional development will emphasize best-practice strategies for challenged readers. |
| Person Responsible | Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Activity #4

Title Math Learning Gains

Rationale Schoolwide Math Learning Gains fell one percentage point, from 76 to 75 percent.

Intended Outcome As a result of a schoolwide focus on professional learning communities and a commitment to academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction, by the end of the 2018-19 School Year, student achievement in Math Learning Gains will increase from 75 to 77 percent.

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

Action Step

Description Grade-level teams will collaborate in professional learning communities to develop common formative assessments in mathematics. Using those assessments, teachers will analyze student results and develop differentiated learning strategies for all students. Teachers will prioritize small-group instruction and participate in professional development related to best practice math strategies for students.

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

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration will require grade-level teams to submit weekly summaries of their collaborative activities, school leaders will focus on academic differentiation through individual and small-group instruction and professional development will emphasize best-practice math strategies for students.

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

Activity #5

Title Character Counts!

Rationale 2017-18 Early Warning Systems and teacher anecdotal data (Summer, 2018) indicated a need for a schoolwide behavior plan that will support the districtwide Character Counts Pillars of Respect, Responsibility, Caring, Trustworthiness, Fairness and Citizenship.

Intended Outcome The 2018-19 SY implementation of Hartley's "How We Live in Our School Family" Behavior Plan- which emphasizes the 'Five Ps: Polite, Prompt, Prepared, Productive and Practicing Safety'- and serves as structural support to the Six Pillars of Character Counts, will result in a one percent (1%) increase in Daily Average Attendance rate, from 96 to 97 percent, and a 10 percent reduction in Out-of-School Suspensions.

Point Person Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Leadership Team members developed the "How We Live in Our School Family" Behavior Plan in June, 2018, the behavior plan was introduced to faculty and staff members during Preplanning, Grade-Level Expectations Assemblies were conducted during the first week of the school year and daily morning announcements provide reminders of the "Five Ps" Polite, Prompt, Prepared, Productive and Practicing Safety".

Person Responsible Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description The principal will use the eSchoolPLUS program to monitor student attendance gains, student conduct referrals and out-of-school suspension data.

Person Responsible Paul Goricki (paul.goricki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)