

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Fishhawk Creek Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fishhawk Creek Elementary School

16815 DORMAN RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Steven Sims

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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)	18%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (71%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fishhawk Creek Elementary School

16815 DORMAN RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[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	14%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

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.

FishHawk Creek will provide all Falcons with a rigorous education enabling them to think critically and become responsible, caring citizens who soar to their academic best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

FishHawk Creek Elementary will soar to the highest level of academic achievement and citizenship.

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
Sims, Steve	Principal	Update SIP plan
Torsone, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Reviews the plan for faculty vote . Presents SIP plan to SAC members
Zulkoski, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Meets with school Sac team to vote to approve school SAC plan. Monitors plan expectations throughout the school year.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Steven Sims

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,044

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

3

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	158	153	181	175	194	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1044
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	6	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	8	6	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	2	5	15	9	17	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	3	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	118	159	158	179	168	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	964
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	11	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	118	159	158	179	168	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	964
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	11	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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				79%	52%	57%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	55%	58%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	50%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	54%	63%	83%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	57%	62%	74%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	46%	51%	65%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				79%	50%	53%	78%	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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	55%	18%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	87%	57%	30%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K,1 &2 SIPPS & I ready diagnostics were used. Second grade also used math monthly's and ELA baseline and EOY formative assessments. 3, 4 and 5 FSA scores were used

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	69	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	58	92
	Students With Disabilities	38	56	75
	English Language Learners	33	67	67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	61	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	50	87
	Students With Disabilities	38	44	81
	English Language Learners	33	67	100

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	69	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	58	74
	Students With Disabilities	34	49	57
	English Language Learners	20	40	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	61	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	49	71
	Students With Disabilities	25	53	71
	English Language Learners	0	40	80
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	87	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	68	88
	Students With Disabilities	72	73	80
	English Language Learners	50	50	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	63	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	57	69
	Students With Disabilities	44	57	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	50

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	75	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	72	82
	Students With Disabilities	73	80	88
	English Language Learners	40	50	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	67	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	47	83
	Students With Disabilities	69	64	80
	English Language Learners	40	50	100
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	69	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	48	53
	Students With Disabilities	58	64	65
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	67	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	57	56
	Students With Disabilities	62	66	74
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	70.70	71	71.28
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.25	54.21	53.41
	Students With Disabilities	81	81	80.72
	English Language Learners	41.50	63	81.97

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	41	65	50	43	69	70	35				
ELL	69			63							
ASN	95			90							
BLK	64			50							
HSP	75	72		80	80		67				
MUL	77			84			80				
WHT	84	72	48	87	81	83	78				
FRL	69	61		65	82	73	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	41	42	42	51	58	54	30				
ELL	68	55	40	69	80	67					
ASN	89	73		96	93						
BLK	63	47		67	71						
HSP	76	63	46	77	67	60	73				
MUL	83	69		89	73		79				
WHT	79	63	61	84	74	62	81				
FRL	69	52	57	66	72	52	70				
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	46	55	43	49	53	36	47				
ELL	58	50	45	63	63						
ASN	90	50		100	75						
BLK	57	47		70	75		55				
HSP	78	63	55	73	57	50	63				
MUL	75	52	45	85	72		71				
WHT	80	59	47	84	76	71	82				
FRL	71	53	48	77	73	68	68				

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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	62
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	93
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	57
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	75
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	80
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	76
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	67
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?

Student gains increased in Mathematics and ELA across all grade levels when compared to previous test data. Bottom quartile gains increased in Mathematics and ELA across all grade levels when using previous test data.

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

Second grade on/above grade level data in ELA and Mathematics showed a decrease from previous years data. Third grade ELA and Mathematics showed a decrease in proficiency from previous years data.

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

Second and third grade were our two highest grades of E learners. Tracking these students has shown us areas needing to improve.

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

Student gains and Bottom quartile gains in ELA and Mathematics all showed increases from 2019 data. Fifth grade proficiency scores increased in Mathematic and ELA also increased.

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

Schoolwide RTI focus and data driven small group instruction have been major focus points for the last two years.

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

Continuing focus on collaborated planning between each grade level and using PLC groups to focus on studying specific grade level data.

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.

We have started a staff book study on the book "You are the Team" that the entire staff will participate in every other Tuesday. This will help teachers understand not only the importance of how to work together as a unit, but will give each member ideas to improve themselves within the team.

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

FHC will continue to focus on all students. We will remain consistent when focusing on grade level production. We will also continue to strive to improve upon the entire RTI process using specific student.data to drive all instruction .

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When reviewing schoolwide data of common grade level classrooms, our data shows varying levels of proficiency, gains, and bottom quartile gains within those grade levels. We will continue to focus on teamwide planning by using specific student data to drive both small group and whole group instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase by 2% proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Teachers will monitor student data during PLCs and discussions will be focused on collaboratively planning instruction to meet the needs of all students. Conversations and planning around which areas to focus on during small groups and/or whole groups will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steve Sims (steven.sims@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using formative data to plan specific target areas for each grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning has been proven to strengthen grade level instruction by teams working together to target specific areas of student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC groups and ILT's will be monitored by administration to ensure validity of data studied. Specific targets will be identified by using the most current student data available.

Person Responsible: Amanda Zulkoski (amanda.zulkoski@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Compared to the state FHC data is extremely low with only one student suspension. FHC will continue to monitor all student discipline data throughout the year and initiate programs through the guidance department with emphasis on student behavior and mental health awareness.

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.

We use a school wide PBS to reward students for positive behavior in the classroom and cafeteria. Students ear weekly rewards as well as nine week rewards based on positive behavior.

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

Cafeteria Staff- Behavior monitoring
Classroom Teachers- Behavior monitoring
Guidance - Run the overall program and distribute prizes

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
Total:			\$0.00