Lithia Springs Elementary School

2021-22 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: 1/4/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Kevin	Principal	Responsible for all academic and operational aspects of the school building.
Ackermann, Danielle	School Counselor	Manages MTSS, RtI and PSLT processes. Provides group, class and individual counseling. Manages all 504 plans. Works with administration to assess school climate and culture and to develop programs to address. Provides SEL support for students, parents and staff proactively and as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 1/4/2015, 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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

581

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

7

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	73	123	89	105	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	9	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				76%	52%	57%	74%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	55%	58%	63%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	47%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	54%	63%	73%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	57%	62%	74%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	46%	51%	55%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	50%	53%	76%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	74%	57%	17%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	75%	51%	24%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kdg - iReady Diagnostic Data - Reading and Math
1st Grade - iReady Diagnostic Data - Reading and Math
2nd Grade - iReady Diagnostic Data - Reading and Math
3rd Grade - Achieve 3K for Reading; iReady Diagnostic for Math
4th Grade - Achieve 3K for Reading; iReady Diagnostic for Math
5th Grade - Achieve 3K for Reading; iReady Diagnostic for Math; District Science Assessment

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	63	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	50	88
	Students With Disabilities	56	87	88
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	59	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	46	85
	Students With Disabilities	67	67	67
	English Language Learners	67	67	67

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	39	71	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	62	69
	Students With Disabilities	42	58	83
	English Language Learners	33	0	33
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	27	62	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	31	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	67
	English Language Learners	0	33	67

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	40	56	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	44	48
	Students With Disabilities	56	57	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	17
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	26	44	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	19	52
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	40	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	21	26
	Students With Disabilities	50	64	72
	English Language Learners	100	100	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	62	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	43	76
	Students With Disabilities	64	93	93
	English Language Learners	0	0	100

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	52	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	37	37
	Students With Disabilities	51	65	72
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	55	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	34	39
	Students With Disabilities	57	74	80
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	71	67	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	58	56
	Students With Disabilities	81	74	87
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Subgroup Data Review

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	46	54	40	55	46		50				
ELL	67			61							
HSP	75	71		70	50		69				
MUL	76	70		68	40		67				
WHT	80	76	53	77	58	35	77				
FRL	53	50	45	61	46		54				
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	69
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	65
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Our students with disabilities have the greatest gaps in terms of reading and math, achievement levels and gains. Our free and reduced lunch students have the greatest gap in math in proficiency and gains.

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

The greatest need for improvement lies in our math gains and math bottom quartile gains.

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

For improvement, we need to use more data driven instruction within tier 1 instruction. By using the data available from math monthly tests, teachers will be able to accelerate rather than remediate. It's critical that we use the data in collaborative planning to form small group instruction when needed and to ensure that tier 1 instruction is effective.

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

ELA proficiency, gains and bottom quartile gains all were increases from the 2019 school year.

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

We have had a strong ELA program thanks to the efforts of our reading coach who was able to break data down through out the year for the benefits of teacher planning. Teachers will need to take this role on and collaborate to ensure continued success and improvement.

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

Collaborative, data based planning - teachers will need to work together to find the areas where acceleration is needed while maintaining strong tier 1 instruction. Also, helping our students develop their ownership of their learning is important.

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 be invited to take part in a book study based on "Inquiry Mindset Assessment Edition" where they will find ways to help students see themselves in a more positive and confident light as well as to cultivate conditions for equity so all learners may thrive. We will also look for PD that can improve the collaborative planning process.

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

Lithia Springs has very little additional resources - which means as a school we must become more resourceful. We will look to develop teacher leaders that can help fill the need for experts in reading and math data analysis, planning and Tier 1 instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher will take part (voluntarily) in a book study of "Inquiry Mindset, Assessment Edition". As we work on strengthening a data driven culture within our school, we would be missing out if we did not spend time talking about how our students need to develop ownership of their own learning and in turn, of how they are assessed. Inquiry Mindset - Assessment Edition the author explores "How can we..." Quoted from book: Help students see themselves in a more positive, confident and personally fulfilling light? Cultivate the conditions for agency and equity in our classrooms and schools so all learners can thrive? Shift education so that our students become more empowered, more competent, and more compassionate young people?
Measurable Outcome:	We will have 80%+ of the staff sign up and participate in 80% minimum of the 8 planned book chats, each covering two chapters.
Monitoring:	This will be measured by the PDS sign in sheet.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	There are a number of influences this will address that have a positive Hattie correlation to student learning including self-efficacy (0.92) and learning goals vs no learning goals (0.66).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The book will help teachers discover way to include students in setting goals and and how they will be measured against those goals. They will be able to provide greater equity for their students as they will plan what each needs rather than planning the same need for all.

Action Steps to Implement

Advertise and buy books based on number of participants

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

Conduct book study chats over 12 week period

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

Provide PD points and evaluation for the book study

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

Study evaluation results, determine next steps with the ILT

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percent age of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2019 math FSA was 75%. This is 2% increase from 2018. However our math learning gains decreased from from 74% to 67% and our bottom quartile gains decreased from 55 to 41%. Students who score a Level 1-2 are typically below level and this creates learning gaps that can be challenging to address as math content moves forward and requires mastery of previous skills in order to be successful with grade level content. Thus acceleration is needed while maintaining Tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of math learning gains will increase 7% back to 74% and our bottom quartile gains will increase 14% back to 55%.
Monitoring:	End of year FSA scores will be the lagging data, math monthly scores will be the leading data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lithia Springs will implement school-wide district monthly math assessments to monitor student progress, identify critical learning needs, and address student learning gaps through small group instruction. Each student will set an individual target goal for these monthly assessments and monitor their progress each month. Teachers will meet in PLCs monthly to analyze student assessment data and create action plans to address student learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing common monthly assessments will allow us to better monitor student learning by providing standards-aligned assessments and identify learning trends and needs. By review and analyzing student assessment data each month, teachers will be able to intervene quickly and address any misconceptions and learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a data wall for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade with sections for prior year FSA score and rows for each math monthly assessment,

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

Create a data sheet (Excel file) to capture all math monthly data, prior year FSA score, goal setting and demographic data.

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

Create mail merge labels to print, post and display the math monthly data after each assessment.

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

After math monthly 3, organize half day planning session for teachers with district math coach to analyze the data and make a plan to increase student achievement.

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

ONCE FSA results are received, analyze the data to determine the effectiveness of the program and make updates and changes as needed.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lithia has a reported 1.4 incidents per 100 students and thus falls into the 'high' category where most school have a rate of 1 or less per 100. The raw number was 9 incidents for 623 students. Lithia has a 'very low' suspension rate ranking number 1 in the state and county. The data suggests that when incidents are addressed they are done so effectively so as to not warrant repeat behaviors resulting in suspension.
Lithia will implement a teacher led positive Behavior Intervention Plan committee that will write and implement our PBIP. They will use the framework developed and provided by the school district. As a starting point, behavior in the cafeteria will be addressed first as this is where most of our underlying behavior issues start. The committee will develop expectations based on CHAMPS, create collateral and also create videos for teachers to share with the class to model and promote appropriate behavior. The committee will meet on a quarterly basis and determine the next phase of the plan based on the next highest need.

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.

Starting with our Positive Behavior Intervention Plan, the PBIP Committee will develop current structures and activities based on the data collected from pre-referral and referral forms. We have a Student Council set up - there are homeroom representatives that meet with and executive board to discuss and address needs as seen from the student point of view. We have a very strong PTA that will have a family event on a monthly basis to encourage parents to be on campus with their children in fun ways. Administration maintains an open door policy where parents are able to see us with respect to our planned and unplanned classroom visits.

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

Students through student council.
Teachers through ILT and Steering Committee.
Parents through their advocating for their children and participating in events that support the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**