

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Just Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Just Elementary School

1315 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Daphne Fourqurean

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Hillsborough 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Just Elementary School

1315 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

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	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

We will provide students with a nurturing, supportive environment where they engage in collaborative, hands-on academic experiences, community service projects, and character development activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To give students a “scientific start,” as lifelong learners who positively impact our community.

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
McDonald, Kevin	Principal	Responsible for the leadership of the school, leading the implementation of the SIP Plan, ensuring that members of the leadership team implement SIP Plan.
Crane, Amanda	Instructional Coach	STEM Coordinator, Building STEM culture through leading of PD, modeling Science Lessons, leading team of teachers in support of STEM integration across the campus.
Witt, Stacey	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Daphne Fourqurean

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	41	49	40	33	42	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Attendance below 90 percent	17	20	14	9	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	57	41	47	45	42	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	26	19	6	14	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	30	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	3	0	13	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	57	41	47	45	42	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	26	19	6	14	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	30	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	3	0	13	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	28%	52%	57%	30%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	55%	58%	68%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	50%	53%	92%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	34%	54%	63%	32%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	62%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	46%	51%	86%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	50%	53%	58%	48%	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	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%
	2018	14%	53%	-39%	57%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	22%	55%	-33%	58%	-36%
	2018	26%	55%	-29%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
	2018	17%	51%	-34%	55%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
	2018	21%	55%	-34%	62%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	57%	-25%	64%	-32%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
	2018	24%	54%	-30%	61%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	31%	52%	-21%	55%	-24%
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	6	21		6	36						
ELL	50			50							
BLK	21	41	31	29	48	73	25				
HSP	59	70		65	70						
FRL	29	46	32	35	53	76	29				
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		33	50	10	60						
ELL	15	40		46	80						
BLK	18	31	42	33	71	59	24				
HSP	17			67							
FRL	19	32	40	36	72	56	30				
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	8			8							
ELL	40			20							
BLK	29	66		33	64	83	57				
HSP	25			27							
FRL	30	68	92	33	62	86	58				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
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.

ELA achievement- lack of focus on comprehension strategies, lack of reading fundamental skills, and lack of engaging instruction.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile - lack of focused intervention with the bottom 25%, lack of focus on vocabulary, especially domain specific words, and hands on activities.

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 - lack of focus on comprehension strategies and lack of engaging instruction.
Trends - a continued narrowing of curriculum, by focusing only on fundamental skills, students performed at the lowest in FSA data on the areas of integration of knowledge, key ideas, and details,

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

Math learning gains-focused on bottom quartile by focusing on small group instruction and scaffolding up to meet standards. Other actions that led to math gains include: teacher knowledge of students' abilities, planning PLC's, backwards planning, consistent and rigorous instruction of math concepts, teacher knowledge on data and data trends, small group instruction with iReady and fact fluency practice.

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

Attendance below 90% (81 total students), Level 1 on statewide assessment (69 students)

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Attendance
3. Lowest 25% in ELA
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students performance in ELA and Math are consistently below district and state averages. The students have also consistently performed lower in ELA than in math. This shows that students do have academic ability but lack skills and engagement in reading. Through standards-aligned STEM integrated lessons student engagement will increase as well as student learning.

Measurable Outcome: Student performance on FSA will increase in ELA, Science and Math by 10% points. The students performance will increase as student engagement increases.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kevin McDonald (kevin.mcdonald@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will collaborate to plan standards based instruction that integrates STEM process skills into their lessons. Teachers will monitor students progress through on-going assessments using formative assessment and i-ready.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are not fully engaged in their learning and therefore are not making the academic gains they should. When teachers have engaging lessons that include collaboration and hands on learning, students are more likely to be active participants.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan standards based instruction in ELA, math, and science that integrates STEM with leadership team.

Person Responsible Kevin McDonald (kevin.mcdonald@hcps.net)

Leadership team will monitor instruction through the use of learning walks, walk-through forms, and informal feedback.

Person Responsible Kevin McDonald (kevin.mcdonald@hcps.net)

Teachers will monitor student growth through formative assessments and summative assessments (including i-ready and district assessments).

Person Responsible Kevin McDonald (kevin.mcdonald@hcps.net)

Teachers will also increase engagement through the use of technology in the classroom, especially STEM technology like coding mice and robotics.

Person Responsible Amanda Crane (amanda.crane@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will utilize culturally proficient strategies with all students, especially the use of culturally relevant text. This strategy will especially support our Students w/Disabilities and Black/African American student groups missing the target according to our ESSA data..

Person Responsible Stacey Witt (stacey.witt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

At Just we build a positive school culture through the use of PBIS. Our school-wide behavior expectations are Just be respectful, Accept responsibility, Give your best effort, and Safety first. These expectations are taught and reinforced throughout the day and during our morning meetings. When students are showing these expectations they are rewarded with JAG bucks. Once a month students can spend their JAGS bucks at the school store. We also have special events that the students can attend. We share the outcomes from our JAGS points monthly with out community in our SAC meeting.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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