Lithia Springs Elementary School

2020-21 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: 1/3/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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.

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	25%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Kevin	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public school sites. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Gattullo, Kristen	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, Elementary, will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of an elementary school.
Ackermann, Danielle	School Counselor	The Counselor, Elementary School, is responsible for coordinating and implementing the school's counseling services program to include academic advisement and counseling, developmental guidance, career development, and parent/community involvement.
Echols, Laurie	Instructional Coach	The Reading Coach will maintain and monitor the implementation of the reading program, including professional development of school personnel. The Reading Coach is responsible for ensuring the comprehensive instruction of reading within the school, as well as compliance with FullTime Equivalency (FTE) rules and guidelines from the Florida Department of Education and the United States Department of Education..

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 1/3/2016, Amber Cronin

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.*
3

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

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)	23%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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](#).	

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	70	115	86	100	93	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	11	10	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	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

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	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

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**	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	0
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%	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	95
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	64
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	63
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	77
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	64
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	61
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.

Math bottom quartile gains was our lowest category at 41% compared to the district's 46% and the state's 51%. Subgroups within the bottom quartile include SWD 44%, Hispanic 31%, White 38% and Free and reduced lunch 24%. More current data from the iReady winter diagnostic shows that 32% of our school is at Tier 2 and 3% is at Tier 3 in math. The majority of these students are 3rd, 4th and 5th grade. In 2018 for the same diagnostic 26% of the students were at tier 2 and 3% at tier 3. We feel that there is not enough differentiation in our math classes included guided math groups and teaching to the core. Teachers report the greatest challenge is lack of number sense.

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

Math learning gains declined by 7 points from the previous year and math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile dropped by 14 points from the previous year.We feel that there is not enough differentiation in our math classes included guided math groups and teaching to the core. Teachers report the greatest challenge is lack of number sense.

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.

The math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile trails the state average by 6 points. The school is above the state average in all other categories .We feel that there is not enough differentiation in our math classes included guided math groups and teaching to the core. Teachers report the greatest challenge is lack of number sense.

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

ELA Learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile increased by 14 points from the previous year. Our reading coach did grade level book studies for defined areas of need. K,1,2 worked through "The Next Steps Forward in Guided Reading" by Jan Richardson and 3,4,5 worked through "Reading Strategies" by Jennifer Serravallo. As a school, we became an AVID Elementary which allowed our teachers to take part in various training. Note taking and increasing rigor through WICOR was found in most grade levels.

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

One area of concern is the number of students with an attendance rate less then 90% and the number of retentions.

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

1. Increase math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile
2. Increase math learning gains overall
3. Increase ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile
4. Increase overall math achievement
5. Increase overall science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Efficient progress monitoring is an area of focus we will work on as a school. As our math learning gains are not what we expect, it is critical that we identify and address areas of opportunity as lead data points are identified rather than waiting to see what the lag data points tell us.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific objective is to create high level progress monitoring so that all students make at least a one year gain in math. This will be measured through iReady diagnostic data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Grade levels will use the 4 Disciplines of Execution to help drive the work. This will allow them to progress monitor on a weekly basis and adjust as they see the effectiveness of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy behind 4DX is to empower all on the team to take personal responsibility for the learning - they will be accountable to their team mates directly and administration indirectly. The grade levels will define the lag data points they want to address that will push the overall school lag data points. Once identified, they will define and measure lead data points on a weekly basis that will get them to their lag measure.

Action Steps to Implement

Initial 4 Disciplines of Execution training - introduction during pre-planning.

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

In depth 4DX training for grade level teams. The training will allow teams to start to differentiate between lead and lag data and what that looks like with the students and resources they have.

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

Grade level specific WIG (wildly important goal) session where the teams will define their first lag measures and go through the process of setting commitments for the coming week. They will begin the design of their scoreboards that will be posted in the office area.

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

Weekly grade level WIG / PLC Meetings - ILT members will be charged with following the agenda for the WIG session. Teachers will each talk about the status of the commitment they made for the previous week, the group will discuss how their commitments are moving the lead measures and what barriers they can remove for each other and then they will commit to an activity for the coming week. Through their discussion, T3 and T2 students will be discussed and forwarded to PSLT as needed.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Learning gains in math and reading will continue to be an area of focus. By emphasizing collaboration and planning through the 4DX process, grade level teams will be enabled to adjust instruction in the short term to ensure long term gains.

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.

Lithia Springs relies on our community being a part of our school. For parents this means volunteering through PTA for events, classroom projects and weekend events such as Beautification Day. Our PTA maintains strong relationships with community businesses who support the school in terms on monetary donations as well as collateral materials and support. Students know our Vision "Leading Successful Empowered Students" and are able to tell visitors what it means to be a Lithia Lynx.

Input from the community is gathered through PTA General Meetings as well as our School Advisory Committee.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00