

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Limona Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marlou Bates

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[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	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

Limona will build a positive, academically challenging and safe environment for students to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Limona students will be prepared to succeed in life.

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
Bates, Marlou	Principal	monitor data Coach teachers Facilitate curriculum discussions Provide professional learning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Marlou Bates

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	93	101	94	95	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	14	6	7	15	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	66%	52%	57%	73%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	62%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	50%	53%	59%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	54%	63%	74%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	68%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	51%	47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	50%	53%	59%	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	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	54%	21%	62%	13%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	27	27	19	42	41						
ELL	56	63	60	59	57	63					
ASN	93	82		93	92						
BLK	53	48	33	63	45		38				
HSP	63	60	42	57	51	52	55				
MUL	52	43		70	46						
WHT	75	61	30	79	51	29	69				
FRL	58	55	40	63	55	59	47				
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	19	35	33	54	47	40					
ELL	54	41	50	54	41	36					
ASN	86			93							
BLK	57	48	40	76	64						
HSP	62	50	63	66	45	39	60				
MUL	74	55		74	64						
WHT	71	61	47	74	45	13	49				
FRL	60	50	43	64	46	30	45				
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	17	45		22	36						
ELL	52	62		60	92						
ASN	86			93							
BLK	72	55		66	59	20	31				
HSP	73	65	55	71	61	36	61				
MUL	71	60		76	70						
WHT	74	60	63	77	71	61	71				
FRL	67	62	55	67	63	45	49				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56

Hispanic Students	
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
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.

Our bottom quartile and ESE showed the lowest performance last year. Teachers were working on standards but additional training/practice is needed.

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

ELA bottom quartile had the largest drop. We were focused on teaching the standards to all and not enough differentiation for our bottom quartile.

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.

35% of our school's bottom quartile made gains. 48% of the state's bottom quartile made gains. We focused on teaching the standards to all and not enough differentiation for our bottom quartile.

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

The math bottom quartile went up the most. Teachers were working on filling math gaps through grouping.

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

N/A, there are no indicators listed.

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

1. Balance RTI reading (especially phonics focus for primary level) and RTI math.
2. Focus on increasing reading and math bottom quartile learning gains.
3. Planning in PLCs.
4. Differentiation to meet the needs of our SWD, bottom quartile, and high students.
5. Using assessment data for planning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the ELA data from 2018 and 2019, students in the bottom quartile made a gain of 35% in 2019, compared to 45% gain in 2018. Also, our SWD students made only 19% gain in 2019, compared to a 33% gain in 2018. Therefore, our focus will be on designating a specific RTI time and using materials that allow us to focus on the specific needs of our students in those sub groups. Teachers will instruct students on how to use accountable talk to answer questions and respond to peers.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020 - 2021 school year, the percent of students in grades 3-5 making gains in the bottom quartile on the FSA ELA will increase from 35% to 50%. Our SWD students' percent will also increase on the FSA ELA from 19% to 35%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs will focus on RTI (MTSS), feedback, and implementing differentiation in ELA and math(designing interventions based on best practices)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RTI (MTSS) allows the teacher to monitor students' progress through use of targeted small group instruction and compare results to group, class, and grade level. Feedback to students is given to identify next steps in student learning, with focus on success. Differentiating content is needed to support students where they are, to fill in gaps, in the curriculum. Focussing on both ELA and math in our PLC discussions and RTI, as we monitor data from RTI can increase the number of students making learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold PLC/Collaboration meetings bi-monthly w/ PLC log to discuss/record RTI discussion; share with PSLT to analyze data and trends, identify barriers, discuss best practices in providing interventions and progress monitoring of student growth.
2. Use iReady Reading data to assist in identifying students with needs; growth monitor.
3. Provide ELP for Reading.
4. Provide time for common planning to focus on standards and questioning.
5. Vertical PLC opportunities throughout the year.
6. Provide teacher training as needed.
7. Coaching and feedback.

Person Responsible Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on previous data, there is a need to increase the performance of students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities will increase student performance in core subject areas from 31% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: MTSS
Strategic Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: MTSS will allow for the teacher to progress monitor student progress through a targeted, small group instruction that can be compared to the grade level, class, and peer group. Planning will be specific for the needs of the students to ensure academic improvement will close the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide differentiated instruction in reading and mathematics.
2. Invite students to the extended learning program.
3. Student conferencing
4. Offer modified curriculum to meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Provide phonics instruction for students in reading K-2.

Use SIPPS, Achieve 3000 and iReady Reading LAFs to support student learning/gains in ELA. Staff will attend PD for phonics and appropriate reading complexities based on student needs. Provide accountable talk cards to aid students with discussion and higher order thinking strategies.

Provide ELP in the areas of ELA for our bottom quartile students to decrease the learning gap.

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.

Teachers assist in decision making through our Steering committee that meets monthly. Additionally, all staff are encouraged to share concerns or ideas for improvement with administration. Parents can participate in our environment through becoming a member of our school SIP team and our school PTA meeting. Our fathers can participate with their children monthly at ALL PRO DADS events. Events are planned throughout the school year to help encourage a positive school climate with parents, teachers and students. Students follow a code of conduct while staff encourage a positive culture through classroom/ school behavior plan.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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