

Duval County Public Schools

Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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: 7/1/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School

6736 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32216

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Robyn	Principal	Manage, ensure safety of all, instructional leadership by providing leadership focused on increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap.
Beck, KaShay	Assistant Principal	Execute the school mission and vision through organizational and instructional leadership that is focused on students being provided high quality academic and social opportunities in a safe, nurturing environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Katherine Stalls

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
--	---------------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	80	66	69	51	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	379
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	3	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 8/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	78	73	65	52	50	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	15	11	19	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	35	45	33	21	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	29	39	35	19	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0

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%	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	66
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	68
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	77
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	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component with the lowest performance was ELA achievement. The proficiency was 51%. Students with disabilities also performed low at 21%. In the 2018-2019 school year there was a shift in curriculum resources that focused on standards and away from the previous resource. In addition, the school had novice teachers in the intermediate grades that required a high level of support.

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

ELA achievement showed the greatest decline going from 59% to 51%. In the 2018-2019 school year there was a shift in curriculum resources that focused on standards and away from the previous resource. In addition, the school had novice teachers in the intermediate grades that required a high level of support.

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.

ELA achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average was 57% whereas the school was 51%. In the 2018-2019 school year there was a shift in curriculum resources that focused on standards and away from the previous resource. In addition, the school had novice teachers in the intermediate grades that required a high level of support.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement was math lowest 25% which increased 14 points from 68% to 82%. A highly effective teacher was placed in 5th grade to lead mathematics instruction for this group.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance and Level 1 on state assessment for ELA

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Achievement for students with disabilities
3. Maintaining math achievement levels and improving

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order to increase student achievement, a focus has been placed on instructional practices related to standards-based instruction. The process for planning and delivering instruction will include teachers working together with the support of administration and instructional coaches to develop fully aligned lessons, tasks, and assessments.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of classroom instruction and assessment will fully align to the standards as measured by the Standards Walk-Through Tool

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Plan using the learning arc process and deliver engaging standards-based lessons that includes providing students with real-time feedback on their performance on tasks that will move them towards proficiency and beyond.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If all instruction and tasks presented to students are aligned to grade level standards, then student achievement will increase. Additionally, if students are made aware of their performance on grade-level expectations and given steps to improve, overall achievement will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule that allows for additional minutes of instruction in the daily schedule and for strategic common planning to occur where we provide time for supported reflection on student assessment data related to performance on standards and creating plans for instruction in whole and small groups, as well as professional development and support with the use of the stands-focus board.

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Support students with targeted needs based on data for small group instruction including using Reading Mastery, Phonics for Reading and Leveled Literacy Intervention during the regular school day and providing additional support after school through teacher tutoring.

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Ensure each classroom is provided with materials and resources suitable to deliver engaging standard-based lessons, including additional classroom supplies, interactive monitors and headphones for students to engage with the audio versions of the online platforms of iReady and Freckle.

Person Responsible KaShay Beck (beckk@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with targeted feedback to improve instructional practices as well as provide coaching support for lesson delivery

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Use the Learning Arc process to develop lesson plans during the common planning that are fully aligned to standards and include development of daily checks for understanding and measuring the mastery of standards

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The leadership team will need to be in full alignment to ensure all students receive standards-based instruction daily as well as work together strategically for school improvement. The leadership team will include instructional coaches for ELA and Math will support new and developing teachers in providing high quality, standards-based instruction and in supporting the facilitation of the school instructional programs.

Measurable Outcome: Instructional walkthroughs will be calibrated so that 90% of observations completed by the leadership team are in alignment and 90% of lessons observed are in full alignment to grade-level standards for the content being presented

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional coaches will assist in the facilitation of common planning with teachers and providing coaching support to develop instructional practices. These staff members will also pull targeted instructional groups and provide instruction to sub groups of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers are provided necessary support and development, then the quality of the instruction provided will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Use Title I funding to purchase additional personnel including a Reading and Math Coach.

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Provide job embedded professional development in developing the instructional leadership skills of the coaches through weekly meetings as a team

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Model and support standards-based common planning and instructional walks of classrooms to observe implementation, develop feedback and support plans for teachers, and prepare next steps for classroom instruction

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

Survey and meet with teachers receiving support from coaches to ensure needs are being met and teachers are being developed in order to retain high-quality instructional staff within the school

Person Responsible Robyn White (whiter4@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parent engagement is a key piece to providing continued support to students both during and after the instructional day.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of our student population has a parent engage with school activities and/or provide their input on school operations at least once a quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	KaShay Beck (beckk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Have a liaison serve as a primary communicator to parents of the resources that are available to them and a coordinator of parent-school communication. If parents are more involved in the daily operations of the school, students will also be more invested in the school operations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If parents feel like a part of the school community, they will be more willing to accept resources and guidance in making sure that their children and maximizing their educational opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

Use Title I funding to add a part time parent liaison to our personnel.

Person Responsible Becky Vickers (vickers.becky@oppaga.fl.gov)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Additional areas of focus will be addressed as the current ones are implemented. Improvement in systems in instruction and leadership team development with impact all areas of achievement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school will build a positive culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved through intentional engagement. A parent liaison will be in place to support parents with navigating the home to

school connection and utilizing the materials available in the Parent Involvement area. The Parent Liaison will also support families of ELL students with connecting to services in the community. The school will host events that encourage engagement with teachers, students, and families that are academically oriented. Partnerships with the community will continue to grow through establishing new relationships with area businesses as well as faith-based partners while continuing to strengthen those that are already in place. The Blessings in a Backpack program will continue to meet the needs of students and families in need.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$49,545.09
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$12,870.17	
<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>						
5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,197.00	
<i>Notes: Headphones</i>						
5100	648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$32,240.90	
<i>Notes: Interactive All in One Monitors</i>						
5100	510-Supplies	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,237.02	
<i>Notes: Classroom Supplies</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				\$129,171.80
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$63,398.12	
<i>Notes: Reading Coach Elementary</i>						
6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$65,773.68	
<i>Notes: Elementary Math Coach</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$5,201.61
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
6100	160-Other Support Personnel	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,201.61	
<i>Notes: Parent Liason (PT)</i>						

	Total: \$183,918.50
--	-----------------------------------