Just Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Just Elementary School

1315 W SPRUCE ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Daphne Fourqurean

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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	Position 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 the SIP Plan.
Crane, Amanda	Instructional Coach	STEM Coordinator, Building STEM culture trough leading of PD, modeling Science lessons, leading team of teachers in support of STEM integration across the campus.
Witt, Stacey	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, building literature across the campus through leading of PD, modeling reading lessons, and leading side by side coaching with teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

216

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	27	33	42	33	29	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203
Attendance below 90 percent	6	15	17	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	13	21	14	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	3	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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 9/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				28%	52%	57%	19%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	55%	58%	32%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	50%	53%	40%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				34%	54%	63%	36%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	71%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	46%	51%	56%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	50%	53%	30%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	22%	55%	-33%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	64%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

I-Ready for ELA and Math, District Science Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	15%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	15%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	22%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	15%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	13%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	14%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	3%	15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	3%	16%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	13%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	13%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	21%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	21%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	3%	7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	3%	7%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	17%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	16%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	14%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	11%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	9%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	14%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	17%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	16%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	14%	18%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	11%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	9%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	14%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	23%	21%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	21%	
	Students With Disabilities	14%	13%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	11			11							
ELL	33			25							
BLK	12	30		11	9						
HSP	30			9							
FRL	15	31		12	14		6				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	86
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	12
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	20
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	16
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA, Math, and Science Achievement are low across all areas and on average 20 points below district and state comparison. This holds true for subgroup of African American and SWD. These groups continue to perform below state and district numbers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA lowest 25th percentile. The data component that needs the greatest amount of improvement is the area of reading. Our scores in reading continue to lag behind and need improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Potentially this is form a lack of intervention with students in the bottom 25%, also these students lack a focus on vocabulary strategies, and basic reading fundamentals skills.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We didn't have any area that should the most improvement all of or areas declined.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Due to COVID lose of learning we did not see any improvement as the time spent outside of school not learning deeply affected student performance.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will need to focus on standards based planning to accelerate core instruction providing just in time scaffolding to help students quickly get on track with their learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue to plan with teachers with an emphasis on acceleration analyzing data regularly to help teachers make real time adjustments to their instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additionally we will need to continue to provide additional tutoring to students to help them to continue to move to being on level and successful.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students' performance in ELA is below district and state averages. According to the data from the state, the %s for reading proficiency from 2021 were: 3rd grade 11%, 4th grade 18%, and 5th grade 21%. A minimum of 50% for each grade was required by the state. Students' performance indicate a lack of comprehension skills, lack of reading fundamental skills, and potentially a lack of engagement.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to raise the performance of ELA proficiency and lowest 25th percentile. We plan to raise proficiency by planning in teams using on grade level materials. We also plan to focus intervention with the bottom 25% focusing on reading fundamentals and vocabulary to build student comprehension.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this outcome using running records, district created assessment, i-ready performance, and also teacher anecdotal.
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 strategies to enhance engagement. Teachers will monitor students progress through daily progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are not fully engaged in their learning and therefore are not making the academic gains as they should. Teacher lessons should not only be engaging but must also address the rigor of the standard. Rigorous instruction coupled with hands on learning, and continuous monitoring that will lead to reteaching as need will lead to student gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan standards based instruction in ELA with reading coach utilizing STEM integration.

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

Teachers will monitor student progress daily using a variety of progress monitoring tools and make real time adjustments to instruction when students are having difficulty.

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

Teachers will increase engagement through the use of technology and STEM tools like coding mice and robotics in ELA instruction.

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 with Disabilities and our Black/African American student groups missing the target according to our ESSA data.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We have decreased our school discipline compared to the data presented in the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website. We currently have 97% of our students without any incidents this year. We monitor every incident of disruption in class using our district behavior tracker system. This data is then discussed during our monthly MTSS meeting. Students with high incidents are then put on a targeted behavior plan. Student behavior plan data is monitored monthly. We monitor school culture through our PBIS system which we use daily points that students earn. Then students can use those points in our PBIS store. Students also have PBIS events that they can participate in based on no behavior calls and minimum behavior trackers.

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.

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 JAGS bucks. Once a month students can spend their JAGS bucks at the school store. We also have special events that our students can attend if they have enough bucks.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We share the outcomes from our JAGS points monthly with our community in our SAC meeting. Our SAC committee is made up of teachers, parents, community partners, and administration.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00