

Duval County Public Schools

# Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School



2019-20 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School

6736 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32216

<http://www.duvalschools.org/hsg>

## Demographics

**Principal: Katherine Stalls**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2015

<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>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: D (35%)
<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>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A

<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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School

6736 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32216

<http://www.duvalschools.org/hsg>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## 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.**

The mission of HSGES is to prepare students for LIFE (Lead, Inspire, Focus, Excel) in every classroom, for every student, every day.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of HSGES is to inspire and prepare students for success in college or a career, and life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
James, Charlene	Principal	Manage, ensure safety of all, instructional leadership by providing leadership focused on increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap.
Peterson, Shalane	Assistant Principal	

### 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	0	62	47	48	50	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Attendance below 90 percent	18	7	7	10	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	1	0	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

19

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/11/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	51%	50%	57%	55%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	53%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	62%	63%	74%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	63%	62%	80%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%	52%	51%	57%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	48%	53%	50%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	62 (0)	47 (0)	48 (0)	50 (0)	49 (0)	256 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 ( )	7 ( )	7 ( )	10 ( )	16 ( )	9 ( )	67 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	55%	51%	4%	58%	-3%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
	2018	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	64%	16%
	2018	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	49%	30%	53%	26%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	21	23		58	77		60				
ELL	43	47		67	79						
BLK	46	45		68	79	85	71				
HSP	51	67		75	83		83				
WHT	56	61		94	91		83				
FRL	52	54	50	78	83	80	77				
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	54	38	40	65	75	70					
ELL	31			56							
BLK	60	64		74	75	58	69				
HSP	56	53		66	76						
MUL	50			86							
WHT	62	44		86	72		92				
FRL	60	55	53	76	72	67	78				

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	40	35	33	36	65						
ELL	33			83							
BLK	49	34		70	69	50	40				
HSP	45	50		64	85						
WHT	62	71		80	90		56				
FRL	53	47	47	69	77	53	44				

**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	68
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

**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%	

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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**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.**

The data with the lowest performance was ELA Proficiency, which was 51%. Last year's contributing factor to the low trend was a decline in 5th grade proficiency, after a large jump in 5th grade proficiency the previous year from the graduating cohort. The current 5th grade cohort had a similar proficiency this year to last year in 4th grade.

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

The data component with the greatest decline this prior year was ELA Proficiency, which declined 8%. The decline is a result of a drop in 5th grade ELA Proficiency, which was around 16%. 3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiency stayed the same or improved.

**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.**

5th Grade ELA Proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The decline was a drop in proficiency as a result of having a cohort with a lower proficiency for 2018-2019 school year, versus the cohort from 2017-2018.

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

Math BQ for 3-5th had the most improvement as a result of a 14 point increase. To meet the needs of these students, the school placed a greater emphasis on providing strategic small group instruction utilizing achievement level descriptors and placed a greater focus on fidelity of data analysis.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

N/A

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency
2. Innovate strategies to maintain high success with BQ students in Math and ELA
3. Develop the capacity of teachers through strategic and purposeful professional development.
4. Increase home-school communication with ESOL parents
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Reading and Math Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	Strong academic instruction is vital to student achievement and school success. If students are given high quality instruction, data components will continue to rise and stay consistent. Students will also be able to continue success the following year in elementary school.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>ELA Proficiency- 51 to 59%</p> <p>ELA Learning Gains- 56% to 60%</p> <p>ELA Bottom Quartile- 62% to 65%</p> <p>Math Proficiency- 79% to 80%</p> <p>Math Learning Gains- 85% to 86%</p> <p>Math Bottom Quartile- 82% to 85%</p> <p>Science Proficiency- 80% to 81%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Shalane Peterson (tanners@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	A Reading and Math Coach position will be used to design, monitor and assess reading and math achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers, work with small groups of students, and implement utilization of the achievement level descriptors. Materials will be purchased to support bottom quartile students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to LLI Kits, Measuring Up, Acaletics, and Study Island online subscription. Tutoring for students after SAI funds are expended.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	When the Achievement Level Descriptors are applied to small group instruction, differentiation takes place for students. The reading and math supplemental materials provides teachers with the opportunity to scaffold learning until mastery of standards. Evidence is collected by teachers based on student success on different standards based level questions. Materials used were Reading A-Z to determine students lexile level, and Ready Florida Standards Pre-Assessment, and i-Ready Standards Mastery Test.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide professional development for teachers on use of Achievement Level Descriptors.</li> <li>2. Collaboration between expert teachers that utilize Achievement Level Descriptors and novice teachers.</li> <li>3. Teacher provided professional development to peers.</li> <li>4. Monthly Annual progress monitor of student growth.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Charlene James (jamesc@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

The other remaining schoolwide improvement priority is increasing parent engagement and use of technology (interactive monitors) to engage student's in the educational process. Parent engagement is crucial to student academic success. To address low parent engagement, the school will host events including carnivals, school academic events, and in-school conference days. We will also secure a

parent liaison to bridge the home-school communication with ESOL parents. Technology (Interactive monitors) provide teachers with creative ways to support their teaching and learning goals. The interactive displays allow more students to get around the panel and learn together.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

The school will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through active engagement. The school will hire a parent liaison to help language barriers with our ESOL parents. In addition, the parent liaison will help parents navigate through language barriers with assistance of ESOL para when they are seeking assistance, scheduling parent conferences, and checking out materials to help build language acquisition. The school will host events, such as carnivals and math/science night to engage parents and families. Since teachers help to run booths and activities, there is an increased opportunity for teachers to create relationships with parents and families. In addition, the school partners with a community church and businesses to run programs that support students, such as Blessings in a Backpack.

### **PFEP Link**

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

### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The school ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing a guidance counselor, Sanford Harmony, and Full Service Schools. Sanford Harmony provides students with social-emotional lessons to help the develop their listening skills, anger management, and other social and emotional development. Full Service Schools provides therapists and other social-emotional support for students and families.

### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Incoming students are provided support from registration until they are seated in the classroom. School policies, expectations, and routines are provided on the school website, Orientation, and Open House. Students are introduced to these procedures by classroom teachers and they are also integrated into the school's culture with student friendships and academic support. Outgoing students are provided information on Middle School and parents and students participate in a 5th Grade Middle School Transition Night. In addition, students in 5th grade participate in a 5th grade puberty lesson to help them transition into middle school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The school utilizes FSA, district and school based data to determine what available resources are needed to close the achievement gaps. In utilizing our progress monitoring data, we look at what supplemental resources are best used for interventions/remediation, enrichment, and tutoring (during the day, before and after school). All budgets go through Shared Decision Making to determine the best places to use federal, state and local dollars to best support instruction, curriculum and personnel. The principal and teachers are responsible for monitoring student progress. We meet weekly during common planning to discuss the effectiveness of the supplemental resource materials. The reading coach keeps track of all supplemental curriculum materials purchased with Title 1 monies.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

N/A

**Part V: Budget**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading and Math Proficiency	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>