Just Elementary School

2022-23 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: 7/26/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: F (24%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (41%)
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	CSI
* 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

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

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	F		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
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fourqurean, Daphne	Principal	Instructional leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others.
Wilcox, Rotunda	Assistant Principal	Oversees implementation and updates to of Curriculum and oversees discipline.
Thomas, DeReca	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair, Kindergarten teacher
Crane, Amanda	Science Coach	Oversees lesson planning of science curriculum K-%, co-teaches, stem lab

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/26/2022, Daphne Fourqurean

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
13

Total number of students enrolled at the school

282

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	44	38	49	42	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Attendance below 90 percent	3	19	23	17	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	5	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	31	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	27	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	29	38	25	20	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	19	23	20	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	11%	53%	56%				28%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	21%						45%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23%						32%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	22%	50%	50%				34%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						52%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						76%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	19%	59%	59%				31%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	22%	55%	-33%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	3	11			22						
BLK	10	20	18	19	41	31	17				
FRL	11	21	23	22	39	31	19				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11			11							
ELL	33			25							
BLK	12	30		11	9						
HSP	30			9							
FRL	15	31		12	14		6				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	24
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	167
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	7
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
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	24
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

According to the School data, black/African American students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD at Just Elementary are performing significantly below grade level in ELA, Math and Science.
2022 FSA Scores
• 11% of the students scored at a level 3 or above in ELA.
21% of the students made learning gains in ELA and 23% of the students in the bottom quartile made learning gains.
• 22% of the students scored at a level 3 and above in Math.
40% of the students made learning gains in Math and 31% of the students in the bottom quartile made learning gains.
• 19% of the students scored at a level 3 or above in Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA, Math and Science

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

Students need to be in attendance and in class daily.
Attendance
% of Students with 90% Rate (Cumulative)

Quarter 1- 63%
Quarter 2 - 57%
Quarter 3 - 58%
Quarter 4 - 56%
Average of 58% students with 90% Rate for the year

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

N/A - there were no improvements

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

N/A - there were no improvements

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

Students will increase their learning gains and work towards mastery of standards in ELA, Math and Science based on baseline, mid-year, and EOY assessments. (Aggressive Progress Monitoring) Students will receive strong daily standards/benchmark-based core instruction. Students will receive small group differentiated instruction daily based on their data and standards acquisition/mastery. Students will receive RTI daily, documentation of strategies and monitoring of growth will be implemented for every BL student. Students will be discussed at MTSS, PSLT and CST. Students will be monitored closely and decisions made by the CST to ensure academic and social/emotional growth for all students with a focus on black/African American students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD.

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.

Teachers will receive on-going professional development in the areas of:
RTI
Differentiated instruction
Using Data to drive instruction
Aggressive Progress Monitoring
Benchmarks
SWBP
Social Emotional Learning
CHAMPS
The Leader in Me
Comprehension Through Conversation
Student Led Conferences

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

Teachers planning weekly with academic coaches (ELA, Math, Science) using student data to plan for their individual needs and fill the gaps in their learning.
Weekly observation and feedback sessions for teachers based on The Four Principles of Excellent Instruction/Best Practices in Classroom Teaching.
Monitoring of student data based on teacher lessons/strategies being executed/implemented.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Area of Focus - Standards Based Planning, Instruction and Learning According to the School data, black/African American students, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged students at Just Elementary are performing significantly below grade level in ELA, Math and Science. 2022 FSA Scores • 11% of the students scored at a level 3 or above in ELA. 21% of the students made learning gains in ELA and 23% of the students in the bottom quartile made learning gains. • 22% of the students scored at a level 3 and above in Math. 40% of the students made learning gains in Math and 31% of the students in the bottom quartile made learning gains. • 19% of the students scored at a level 3 or above in Science.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students will increase their learning gains and work towards mastery of standards in ELA, Math and Science based on baseline, mid-year, and EOY assessments. Students will receive strong daily standards/benchmark-based core instruction. Students will receive small group differentiated instruction daily based on their data and standards acquisition/mastery.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Students will increase their learning gains and work towards mastery of standards in ELA, Math and Science based on baseline, mid-year, and EOY assessments. Students will receive strong daily standards/benchmark-based core instruction. Students will receive small group instruction daily based on their data and standards acquisition/ mastery. Monitoring of exit tickets for each lesson/small group, along with formative assessments and monthly assessments. Aggressive progress monitoring, along with adjusting instructional strategies for benchmarks as needed, to ensure growth of all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Daphne Fourqurean (daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Standards Based Planning, Instruction and Assessments Differentiated instruction to ensure students academic growth
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	Standards Based planning, instruction, and assessments will ensure students are being taught, lessons are being executed and student learning is being monitored for academic growth. Monitoring of instructional strategies and growth will ensure students acquisition of benchmarks.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

1. Leverage Leadership (Formal Observations, informal weekly observation and feedback) focusing on differentiated instruction in small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Admin)
2. Instructional Learning Walks focusing on differentiated small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Leadership Team utilizing Look-For's based on the 4 principles)
3. Coaching Cycles (Increased cognitive lift, student process structures, scripting lesson questions and responses to misconceptions). (Admin and Academic Coaches)
4. PLC's - Data chats, Content professional development, review and monitor of SIP, Progress Monitoring. (Admin, Leadership Team, Academic Coaches)
5. Content rich standards-based planning - using a backwards design to planning for standards/ benchmark acquisition- along with formative and summative data to monitor student growth and acquisition of standards/benchmark acquisition and individual students' needs. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
6. Data driven core and small group differentiated instruction. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
7. Data digs - aggressive progress monitoring incorporated into weekly planning sessions. Active monitoring in class by teachers and follow up discussions during leverage leadership feedback sessions focusing on student academic growth based on benchmark data.

Person Responsible   Daphne Fourqurean (daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net)

1. Leverage Leadership (Formal Observations, informal weekly observation and feedback) focusing on differentiated instruction in small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Admin)
2. Instructional Learning Walks focusing on differentiated small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Leadership Team utilizing Look-For's based on the 4 principles)
3. Coaching Cycles (Increased cognitive lift, student process structures, scripting lesson questions and responses to misconceptions). (Admin and Academic Coaches)
4. PLC's - Data chats, Content professional development, review and monitor of SIP, Progress Monitoring. (Admin, Leadership Team, Academic Coaches)
5. Content rich standards-based planning - using a backwards design to planning for standards/ benchmark acquisition- along with formative and summative data to monitor student growth and acquisition of standards/benchmark acquisition and individual students' needs. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
6. Data driven core and small group differentiated instruction. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
7. Data digs - aggressive progress monitoring incorporated into weekly planning sessions. Active monitoring in class by teachers and follow up discussions during leverage leadership feedback sessions focusing on student academic growth based on benchmark data.

Person Responsible   Daphne Fourqurean (daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net)

1. Leverage Leadership (Formal Observations, informal weekly observation and feedback) focusing on differentiated instruction in small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Admin)
2. Instructional Learning Walks focusing on differentiated small groups and increased student cognitive lift.

(Leadership Team utilizing Look-For's based on the 4 principles)
3. Coaching Cycles (Increased cognitive lift, student process structures, scripting lesson questions and responses to misconceptions). (Admin and Academic Coaches)
4. PLC's - Data chats, Content professional development, review and monitor of SIP, Progress Monitoring. (Admin, Leadership Team, Academic Coaches)
5. Content rich standards-based planning - using a backwards design to planning for standards/benchmark acquisition- along with formative and summative data to monitor student growth and acquisition of standards/benchmark acquisition and individual students' needs. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
6. Data driven core and small group differentiated instruction. (Admin and Academic Coaches)
7. Data digs - aggressive progress monitoring incorporated into weekly planning sessions. Active monitoring in class by teachers and follow up discussions during leverage leadership feedback sessions focusing on student academic growth based on benchmark data.

Person Responsible   Daphne Fourqurean (daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Spring I-Ready Reading Data
K - 29/46 students were BL, 53%
1st - 40/47 students were BL, 85.1%
2nd - 40/48 students were BL, 83.3%

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

90% of students in grade 3 were NOT proficient in ELA
97% of students in grade 4 were NOT proficient in ELA

82% of the students in 5th grade were NOT proficient

11% of the students in grade 3-5 scored at a level 3 or above in ELA.
21% of the students in grade 3-5 made learning gains in ELA
23% of the students in grade 3-5 in the bottom quartile made learning gains in ELA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in K-2nd grade will work towards reading mastery through implementation of benchmark based planning, effective implementation of the lessons planned, aggressive progress monitoring, differentiated small group instruction daily to fill the learning gaps based on the data. As a result, students making learning gains of at least one year will increase by 100% and students reaching mastery will increase to 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in 3rd-5th grade will work towards reading mastery through implementation of benchmark based planning, effective implementation of the lessons planned, aggressive progress monitoring, differentiated small group instruction daily to fill the learning gaps based on the data. As a result, students making learning gains of at least one year will increase by 100% and students reaching mastery will increase to 50%.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students will increase their learning gains and work towards mastery of standards in ELA based on baseline, mid-year, and EOY assessments. Students will receive strong daily standards/benchmark-based core instruction. Students will receive small group instruction daily based on their data and standards acquisition/mastery. Monitoring of benchmarks will occur daily through benchmark aligned daily exit tickets, monthly assessments and formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fourqurean, Daphne, daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

I-Ready, SIPPS, ACHIEVE 3000, Guided Reading

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

I-Ready, SIPPS, ACHIEVE 3000, and Guided Reading are all research based programs that differentiate instruction based on the students' needs to fill academic reading deficits. The programs can adjust as students gain skills and students needs are monitored to ensure growth towards reading mastery.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching Teachers will take part in weekly lesson planning, instruction will be monitored/coached and students' acquisition of benchmark and skills will be aggressively monitored for progress.	Fourqurean, Daphne, daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net
Assessment - PLC's - Data chats, Content professional development, review and monitor of SIP, Progress Monitoring. (Admin, Leadership Team, Academic Coaches) Content rich standards-based planning - using a backwards design to planning for standards/benchmark acquisition- along with formative and summative data to monitor student growth and acquisition of standards/benchmark acquisition and individual students' needs. (Admin and Academic Coaches) Data driven core and small group differentiated instruction. (Admin and Academic Coaches)	Fourqurean, Daphne, daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net
Professional Learning - Leverage Leadership (Formal Observations, informal weekly observation and feedback) focusing on differentiated instruction in small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Admin) Instructional Learning Walks focusing on differentiated small groups and increased student cognitive lift. (Leadership Team utilizing Look-For's based on the 4 principles) Teachers will take part in weekly informal observation and feedback sessions to increase capacity in student learning. Teachers will take part in PD and Coaching Cycles based on their needs, along with weekly data digs and lesson planning. PD's offered will be based on student engagement, benchmarks, RTI, differentiation, and using data to drive instruction.	Fourqurean, Daphne, daphne.fourqurean@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Positive culture is built through a variety of community initiatives to build student, teacher and parent capacity through social emotional learning for all stake holders, after school community building through Just Gents, social emotional learning through Frameworks of Tampa Bay, school wide mentoring program and partnerships with a variety of churches and law offices to support positive behavior for both teachers and students. All community and business partners share the same vision in increasing students' academic capacity, social emotional well being, along with building a positive environment and culture .

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

1. Just Love - Idlewild Baptist - sponsors the Jag Store(PBIS store), Jag Parent Store, donates school supplies, teacher incentives and mentors students
2. Omega Psi Phi Fraternity - Just Gents, mentors
3. Seedfolks - after school community partner sponsoring student club promoting gardening
4. Feeding Tampa Bay - supports families with food bank
5. Urban League - sponsors after school programs
6. Boys and Girls Club - provides after school care and tutoring during the day
7. Frameworks of Tampa Bay - provides social/emotional learning for students and parents.
Beulah Baptist Church - supports school with school supplies, mentors and community events
8. Hillsborough Association of Women Lawyers - mentors
9. Hillsborough Bar Association - school supplies, mentors
The goal in involving the community is to build the capacity of our community to support our students in becoming productive members of society through increasing their academic and social /emotional learning as a result the school community will have a positive culture and environment.