

Duval County Public Schools

Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

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	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School

6736 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32216

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

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.

Our Vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
Stalls, Kathy	Principal	Support reading and small group instruction Establish a small group framework in alignment with B.E.S.T Standards Monitor Reading small group and whole practices Coach and mentor novice and struggling teachers Host and Collaborate with teachers during Reading common planning Track schoolwide Reading data
Bryant, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher for 5th grade Science.
Morris, Phalda	Teacher, PreK	Classroom teacher VPK

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.

The following stakeholders will assist in developing the SIP:

School Leadership Team, School Advisory Council, Parents, and Business Partners

These stakeholders will meet monthly to review progress and continuous growth of students.

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))

The SIP will be monitored monthly in alignment with current and updated student achievement data. The alignment of the B.E.S.T. academic standards with classroom teaching and learning will also be part of the monitoring system. The plan will be revised in order to document continuous improvement. The SIP will be reviewed by the School Advisory Council and the school's Leadership Team for advisement and revision of the SIP based on student achievement on classroom assessments, and interim assessments, both district and State.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 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	0	3	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	29	0	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	29	0	0	0	0	61	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	15	32	29	32	0	0	0	125	

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	6	0	38	26	0	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	34	23	31	30	25	26	0	0	0	169	
One or more suspensions	5	0	7	2	2	3	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	8	18	25	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	20	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	6	16	32	39	44	0	0	150	

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	5	13	6	7	15	20	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	34	23	31	30	25	26	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	5	0	7	2	2	3	0	0	0	19
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	8	18	25	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	20	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	6	16	32	39	44	0	0	150

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	5	13	6	7	15	20	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	34	48	53	41	50	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				41			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			50		
Math Achievement*	41	58	59	49	48	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				56			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			31		
Science Achievement*	51	52	54	33	59	59	35		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	54	59	49			51		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	19	Yes	2	2
ELL	30	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	32	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	43			

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	43			

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				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	41			

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	34			41			51					65
SWD	17			27							3	
ELL	17			37			0				4	65
AMI												
ASN	61			78							3	75
BLK	30			38			55				4	
HSP	23			26			36				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	38			44			64				4	
FRL	31			38			40				5	67

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	41	41	33	49	56	29	33					49
SWD	15	27	30	29	46		18					
ELL	33	50	40	41	47	25	21					49
AMI												
ASN	75	64		88	75							

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	30	28		41	55	30	25					
HSP	39	45		44	57		23					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	43		47	46		42					
FRL	37	41	41	43	54	28	34					48

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	43	37	50	53	43	31	35					51
SWD	14	23		28	23		8					
ELL	32	40		47	40		36					51
AMI												
ASN	56			72								67
BLK	30	25		42	45		10					
HSP	43	47		55	41		44					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			57								
FRL	42	38		54	38		29					50

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	35%	47%	-12%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	26%	50%	-24%	58%	-32%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	46%	-17%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	58%	-15%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	48%	-3%	51%	-6%

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.

Reading proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 were the lowest areas of performance. Our teachers and students were challenged with new standards and new curriculum across all grade levels. Assessments were largely computer-based, with longer testing sessions. Students were challenged to maintain their focus for the necessary length of time needed to complete the assessments.

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

Reading proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 showed the greatest decline. One of the possible factors in this decline was lack of experienced teachers. We had two full-time substitute teachers in our classrooms, one each in 5th grade reading and 3rd grade reading. We also had a new teacher to our school district from out of state in 4th grade reading. This was a challenging teaching and learning situation for the teachers and for the students.

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.

English Language Arts (ELA) in 4th grade had the greatest gap when compared to the State average. Hogan's proficiency was 26% and the State's proficiency was 58%. The difference is 32%. ELA overall was below the State average. The lowest gap percentage was in 5th Grade ELA where there was an

experienced teacher for a long period of time. The least experienced teachers were in 3rd grade (one new to teaching and one substitute) and in 4th grade teacher new to the state/district).

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

The component with the most improvement was in the area of science. The proficiency rate increased from the previous year 21-22 by 13%. The school received support from our district's science specialist each week. The teacher also strengthened knowledge of the curriculum and developed a more streamlined presentation model for the students.

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

After reviewing the data, one potential area of concern is reading proficiency. Reading proficiency dropped by at least 10 percentage points over the previous year in each grade level, 3, 4, and 5.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency for all sub-groups for the 2023-2024 school year.
2. Monitor and support at-risk students.
3. Increase the numbers of high-performing students in proficiency levels 3, 4, and 5.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Positive Culture and Environment: We will continuously strive to support achievement for all. To address the need of reducing schoolwide behavior infractions, ongoing monitoring and support will take place everyday for all students as it is a schoolwide initiative. PBIS and Restorative Justice will play a major role in this initiative. Teachers will be trained through Professional Development on handling Tier 1 and Tier 2 Infractions within the classroom using a systematic approach through evidence-based PBIS and Restorative Justice Practices.

Aligned Reading Instructional Practices: 3-5 ELA LP growth was the lowest performing subgroup during the 22/23 school year. To address the deficit, our plan is to provide continuous support with coaching and planning. Extensive support and intervention will be provided for our novice, career changer, and long term substitute teacher population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The rate of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Disciplinary Infractions will be reduced by 50% from the previous year by mid-year and by 75% by June 1st 2024 as evidenced through Focus disciplinary data.

Student Reading proficiency achievement levels will increase by 50% by June 1st 2024.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS Walkthrough tool will be used to monitor the fidelity of tier 1 behavior inventions within classrooms. Restorative Justice Practices will be used at the schoolwide level to reinforce Positive Climate and Environment. Restorative justice forms will be collected and analyzed for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 Disciplinary Infractions on a quarterly basis.

Classroom Rules and Schoolwide Behavior Expectations will be posted to reflect Hogan-Spring's Mission and Vision.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Implement Restorative Justice forms for disciplinary infractions. Collect the forms quarterly for review for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 Disciplinary Infractions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy should lead to fewer disciplinary infractions and will allow for further discussions with teachers and students related to the disciplinary infractions.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

Hogan-Spring Glen will create a positive school culture with a coherent vision for excellence. We will flexibly respond to challenges, craft solutions, and reinforce practices that support student success. A positive environment will also promote a sense of belonging and connectedness in order to support social and emotional well-being. We will focus on improving school attendance and by reducing the number of days students are absent from school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our most current school data on absences tells us we have 29% or 130 students who were absent from school more than 20 days. Our goal is to reduce the number of student absences by 50%, which would equate to 65 students.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will encourage school attendance and reward students who attend school regularly. Daily and weekly incentives will be utilized. Attendance awards will be announced and celebrated in class. Classrooms with improved and on-going great attendance will be recognized on the morning announcements and at monthly flag-raising.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Bryant (bryantk@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Daily attendance rosters will be checked for absences by the teachers, administrators, and Data Entry Clerk. Students with multiple absences will be monitored closely for support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be better prepared for success in school and in life with improved school attendance.

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.

Leadership Team will attend the BSI Conference Summer 2024

Teachers and administrators will monitor absences daily.

Person Responsible: Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

By When: June 2024

Faculty Book Study - "Ruthless Equity - Disrupt the Status Quo and Ensure Learning for ALL Students"

Person Responsible: Diana Livingston (livingstod@duvalschools.org)

By When: January 2023

Professional Development outside of contracted work day for a book study and collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

ESSA Subgroups: SWD, ELL and Black students will be the focus based on state and district assessment data

Measurable Outcome:

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

District Assessments, Weekly Interventionst Assessment Data

Monitoring:

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

Weekly Common Planning will be utilized by the admin. team to work with teachers in small groups to assist their understanding of providing a positive culture in the classrooms and other areas of the school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Reading Interventionists and Vary Exceptionalities teachers will work with targeted small groups using push-in strategies to assist students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction allows for the targeting of basic skills

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.

A Supplemental Reading Interventionist will be funded through Title I funding for this school year, 2023-2024. The interventionist will be utilized as a support for the teachers and the students.

Person Responsible: Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

By When: October, 2023

Tutoring will be offered before and after school. Tutoring will be available to all students in math, reading and science and groups will be targeted to ESSA subgroups and student needs

Person Responsible: Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Whole group and small group instruction that is aligned to benchmarks increases student achievement on the benchmarks

Measurable Outcome:

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

Blended Learning Benchmark Assessments, Teacher Lesson Plans, District Assessments, State Assessments, Benchmark Walk Throughs

Monitoring:

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

Weekly Common Planning and Walk Throughs, Small Group/Differentiated Lesson Plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

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.)

Blended Learning is aligned to State Benchmarks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Blended Learning allows for differentiated targeted lessons for students in a larger setting allowing for teachers to pull small/individual students for support

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?

Yes

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.

Purchase Blended Learning License for IXL Math and Reflex Math for implementation of differentiated instruction in the area of math

Person Responsible: Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Small group instruction to support differentiated learning will be implemented in all classrooms using manipulatives including magnetic letters/reading

Person Responsible: Kimberly Bryant (bryantk@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

Small group instruction to support differentiated learning will be implemented in all classrooms using manipulatives including magnetic letters/reading

Person Responsible: Kimberly Bryant (bryantk@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:

- >Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
- >Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
- >The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
- >Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
- >Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Hogan-Spring Glen Elementary School will communicate SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders through the monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. The SAC meetings will be held monthly from October, 2023, through May, 2024.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Hogan-Spring Glen will cultivate and build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders through activities and partnerships at the school. Planned meetings and activities at the school and off-campus will be engaging and informative for all stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Hogan-Spring Glen teachers will participate in targeted professional development in order to strengthen their knowledge of State B.E.S.T. standards and curriculum. Class schedules will reflect an optimal amount of time for learning to occur. The Hogan-Spring Glen administrative team will work with teachers to ensure their lesson planning is focused on high-quality teaching and learning. Focused feedback from classroom observations and walk-throughs will be provided to teachers in order to strengthen the school's academic program.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This school is implementing the supplemental Title I, Part A grant project. The activities in the Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement plan were derived based on a Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process involving internal and external stakeholders. The Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement Budgets include activities reflecting the use of funds and a rationale for each activity. Email title1@duvalschools.org for the school's Title I Schoolwide budget or Parent and Family Engagement plan and budget.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$14,322.16
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	330	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,075.00
			<i>Notes: BSI Conference: June 2023, Orlando, FL, 3 participants x \$650 (hotel), 3 participants x \$175 (travel), 3 participants x \$200 (per diem)</i>			
	6400	510	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Supplies: Faculty Book Study - "Ruthless Equity - Distrust the Status Quo and Ensure Learning for ALL Students" for 35 staff members for 35 books @ \$22.89 each</i>			
	6400	120	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$8,400.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Stipend for 35 teachers x 1 hour x 10 weeks @ \$24/hour</i>			
	6400	200	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,847.16
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Benefits 35 teachers x 1 hour x 10 weeks @ 24/hour 21.99% benefits rate</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$160,827.77
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$107,000.00
			<i>Notes: Supplemental Reading Interventionist Salary for 2 positions @ \$69,758 each</i>			
	5100	120	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$41,558.80
			<i>Notes: Supplemental Reading Interventionist Benefits for 2 positions @ \$17,758 each</i>			
	6400	120	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$9,750.00
			<i>Notes: Before & After School Tutoring Stipend (15 teachers x 3 hours/week x 10 weeks @ \$24/hour)</i>			
	6400	200	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School			\$2,518.97
			<i>Notes: Before & After School Tutoring Benefits (15 teachers x 3 hours/week x 10 weeks @ 21.99%)</i>			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$18,817.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	369	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,295.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math License for all students in Grades K-5th</i>			

	5100	369	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: IXL Math License for all students in Grades K-5th</i>			
	5100	510	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$9,972.63
			<i>Notes: Office & Classroom Supplies</i>			
	5100	510	0641 - Hogan Spring Glen Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,050.00
			<i>Notes: Curriculum Associates Magnetic Reading Manipulatives & Materials</i>			
Total:						\$193,967.56

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No