Lithia Springs Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lithia Springs Elementary School

4332 LYNX PAW TRL, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amber Cronin

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%) 2014-15: A (85%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](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

Lithia Springs Elementary School

4332 LYNX PAW TRL, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

24%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

32%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Lithia Springs will transform teaching and learning for our students by creating a student-centered ecosystem that empowers students to excel as 21st Century scholars and caring, active and positive members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Leading
Successful
Empowered
Students

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Kevin	Principal	
Gattullo, Kristen	Assistant Principal	

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	91	91	101	122	117	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	5	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	5	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	5	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	76%	52%	57%	81%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	55%	58%	73%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	68%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	54%	63%	78%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	57%	62%	67%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	54%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	50%	53%	86%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	91 (0)	91 (0)	101 (0)	122 (0)	117 (0)	124 (0)	646 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	11 (7)	5 (5)	3 (4)	7 (6)	9 (4)	35 (27)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (1)	2 (0)	1 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)	7 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (5)	17 (21)	18 (10)	36 (36)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (5)	17 (21)	18 (10)	36 (36)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
	2018	71%	53%	18%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
	2018	74%	55%	19%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	54%	18%	62%	10%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	57%	17%	64%	10%
	2018	78%	57%	21%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	75%	51%	24%	53%	22%
	2018	76%	52%	24%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	53	63	56	49	60	44	46				
ELL	56			75							
ASN	100	92		95	92						
BLK	64			64							
HSP	77	73		67	55	31	73				
MUL	76	94		68	69						
WHT	75	65	49	76	66	38	76				
FRL	72	74	80	65	50	24	61				
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	43	41	40	36	61	50	40				
ELL	75			75							
ASN	91	61		96	89						
HSP	77	80		62	85		93				
MUL	62	46		57	62						
WHT	73	64	44	76	73	51	75				

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
FRL	64	58	38	57	67	50	59				

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	60	77	77	57	53	50	54				
ELL	64			77							
ASN	89	72		96	78						
HSP	77	78		82	73		75				
MUL	76	62		65	46						
WHT	81	72	73	78	67	56	89				
FRL	68	70	68	61	49	35	85				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest performance last year was our learning gains with our bottom quartile students in math with only 41% of this group showing gains, which is a drop from the previous year. There has been a declining trend over the past couple of years in both Math and ELA bottom quartile gains.

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

The greatest decline from the 2018 school year was in our Math Bottom Quartile Gains going from 55% to 41%, a 14% decline. Also of note in the increase in ELA Bottom Quartile Gains, however only 61% of this group showed gains.

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.

There is a gap when we compare our Math Lowest 25th Percentile to the state averages, with a 10% difference. This is not a trend. All pervious years the school has always been above the state average.

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

ELA learning gains points increased by 8 points from the previous year. The school worked closely with the reading coach this past year to improve guided reading strategies at all grade levels. Our teachers used i-ready data to target student needs. This along with incentives for students to complete i-ready lessons increased the time students were receiving targeted instruction. This also includes small group math instruction that allowed teachers to target areas of need for small groups of students as well as to provide enhancement for students that showed a degree of mastery standard to standard.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Reflecting on our school's EWS data we noticed attendance was a potential are of concern. We also noticed that the number of students with two or more EWS has jumped from 4 students to 12.

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

1. BQ Learning gains in Math
2. Learning gains in Math
3. Attendance
4. ELA BQ learning gains
5. ELA learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math bottom quartile learning gains
Rationale	Our bottom quartile math learning gains were 41%, below the district's average of 46% and the state's average of 51%. This is a 14% drop from the previous school year. Math learning gains for all students were at 67%. There is a small gap between our students on free and reduce lunch and white students, 24% of FRL students had a gain compared to 38% of the white students. 44% of our SWD had a gain compared to 38% of our white students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lithia Springs Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains and all students gain will increase to 100% of the students making a year's worth of growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	AVID Elementary Foundations We became an AVID elementary school for the 2019-2020 school year. AVID, an acronym for Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a program that helps schools to close opportunity gaps and prepare all students for college, careers and life. AVID is about acceleration, not remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AVID Elementary looks different in elementary school. It is based on the same learning foundation and philosophies, but is designed to integrate into daily routines and curriculum across grade levels to impact schoolwide structures. Teachers will receive extensive professional development in how to implement AVID structures and processes. Central to AVID Elementary classes is WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading) which is used to enhance expectations per grade level and promote best teaching practices to develop consistency in thinking, processing and delivering information by both students and teachers.

Action Step	
Description	1.The Instructional Leadership Team will use i-Ready Growth Monitoring to track student progress with an emphasis on our 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile. The ILT will assist in helping teachers to adjust instruction as needed. 2.The Instructional Leadership Team will provide their grade levels with strategies and information related to writing instruction. 3.Teachers on the 5th grade team are attending CGI (Cognitively Guided Instruction) training throughout the school year. 4.Grade Level PLCS will work with the Assistant Principal to complete data dives after math formatives to look at trends and instructional needs.

5. ESE teachers will use guided math practices to work with ESE students on a daily basis.

6.Implement an ELP program focusing on the bottom quartile in math in 4th and 5th grade and i-Ready BL in 3rd grade

Person Responsible   Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains - All and BQ
Rationale	Our bottom quartile ELA learning gains were 61%, above the district's average of 53% and above the state's average of 50%. ELA Learning gains for all students were at 71% and for the bottom quartile were 61%, a 14-point increase from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lithia Springs ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains and All Student Gains will increase to 100% of the students making a year's worth of growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	AVID Elementary Foundations We became an AVID elementary school for the 2019-2020 school year. AVID, an acronym for Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a program that helps schools to close opportunity gaps and prepare all students for college, careers and life. AVID is about acceleration, not remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AVID Elementary looks different in elementary school. It is based on the same learning foundation and philosophies, but is designed to integrate into daily routines and curriculum across grade levels to impact schoolwide structures. Teachers will receive extensive professional development in how to implement AVID structures and processes. Central to AVID Elementary classes is WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading) which is used to enhance expectations per grade level and promote best teaching practices to develop consistency in thinking, processing and delivering information by both students and teachers.

Action Step	
Description	1. The Instructional Leadership Team will use i-Ready Growth Monitoring to track student progress with an emphasis on our 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile. The ILT will assist in helping teachers to adjust instruction as needed. 2. The Instructional Leadership Team will provide their grade levels with strategies and information related to writing instruction. 3. Grade level PLCs will work with the Reading Coach to utilize Burke Books as well as The Reading Strategies Book and grade level data to drive and design instruction in grades 4 and 5. 4. Grade level PLCs will work with the Reading Coach to utilize The Reading Strategies Book as well as The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading and grade level data to drive and design instruction. 6. Grade levels will all use a Mentor Sentence strategy that will help improve writing skills and the use of common academic language across grade levels.

7. ESE teachers will use SRA Corrective Reading Program with the ESE students on a daily basis.

Person Responsible   Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).