

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Stowers 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	18

Stowers Elementary School

13915 BARRINGTON STOWERS DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Cochrane

Start Date for this Principal: 4/7/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	15%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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

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	18

Stowers Elementary School

13915 BARRINGTON STOWERS DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[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 KG-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	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.

Provide meaningful, engaging instruction and experiences that promote the development of well-rounded students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a leader of holistic education in the district by developing productive, contributing, and successful members of society.

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
Lennard, Catherine	Principal	
Robinson, Dustin	Assistant Principal	
Walters, Elissa	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 4/7/2009, Melanie Cochrane

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	15%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	121	114	126	123	158	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	6	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	1	2	3	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	

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	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	132	120	127	180	147	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	863
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	0	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	1	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	132	120	127	180	147	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	863
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	0	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	1	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	79%	52%	57%	73%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	55%	58%	68%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	54%	63%	80%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	57%	62%	70%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	46%	51%	57%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	50%	53%	67%	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	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
	2018	81%	53%	28%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	54%	33%	62%	25%
	2018	88%	55%	33%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
	2018	89%	57%	32%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	80%	54%	26%	60%	20%
	2018	83%	54%	29%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	51%	22%	53%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	52%	25%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	59	55	50	66	64	67	42				
ELL	76	82		82	73						
ASN	84	67		94	87						
BLK	89	71		89	79						
HSP	79	69	50	79	60	56	58				
MUL	58	36		79	45						
WHT	80	67	56	84	73	63	76				
FRL	60	64	29	70	67	38	62				
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	54	60	58	58	60	48	55				
ELL	50			75							
ASN	96	85		92	80		91				
BLK	69	31		78	57		73				
HSP	69	51	25	81	68	59	82				
MUL	65	53		87	73						
WHT	77	58	56	86	58	49	74				
FRL	55	49	35	69	55	38	55				
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	46	62	50	52	54	40	28				
ELL	45	79		68	56		50				
ASN	94	80		94	87						
BLK	56	55	21	70	61	50	59				
HSP	63	69	77	70	64	45	51				
MUL	71	67		69	63		64				
WHT	77	69	48	85	73	63	74				
FRL	56	57	48	62	56	40	40				

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	71
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	79
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	83
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	82
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	67

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	55
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	71
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.

In analysis of data from our winter iReady diagnostics, 5th grade math performance of students performing in the bottom quartile is our greatest area of need. Data indicate this is influenced by limited small group instruction and gaps in learning and assessment.

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

In analysis of data from our winter iReady diagnostics, 5th grade math performance is our greatest area of decline. Data indicate this may be related to limited small group instruction. Gaps in learning may also be a contributing factor

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.

Based on the 18-19 FSA ELA scores, our ELA bottom quartile is the only component below the state average.

Stowers ELA Bottom Quartile: 52

State ELA Bottom Quartile: 53

We look to address this by focusing on providing differentiated interventions to students in the bottom quartile.

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

Achievement in 3rd grade ELA continues to be an area of strength for Stowers Elementary. This is attributed to targeted ELA instruction in grades K-3 with an emphasis on tiered interventions.

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

In review of EWS and recent formative assessment data, Stowers remains focused on addressing the academic needs of students performing in the bottom quartile of ELA and math.

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

1. Bottom quartile performance - Math
2. Bottom quartile performance - ELA
3. Grade 5 mathematics performance
4. SWD assessment performance
5. Science (SSA) performance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Stowers Elementary is committed to meeting the needs of all learners through intentional lesson differentiation. The importance of high quality, differentiated instruction is especially true for learners in our bottom quartile and students with disabilities. The need differentiated instruction has been exponentially multiplied by the barriers associated with a pandemic. Furthermore, a focus of differentiation allows you enrich the academic experience for high-performing learners.

Measurable Outcome: Stowers Elementary School seeks to improve student performance in the in all academic areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catherine Lennard (catherine.lennard@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Intensive and data-driven small group instruction will be utilized to differentiate for all learners with an increased emphasis on students performing the bottom quartile.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: At the heart of differentiation is making decisions that benefit the individual student. These decisions should be influenced by relevant data and identified trends. In the area of mathematics, teachers will work to maximize the time devoted to small group instruction. As appropriate, small group, differentiated math instruction will be provide authentic learning experiences and multiple opportunities to capture student data.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that instructional personnel have the data and disaggregation skills necessary to make informed instructional decisions.

Person Responsible Dustin Robinson (dustin.robinson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Assist instructional personnel with identifying resources to meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Dustin Robinson (dustin.robinson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Work to continuously support instructional personnel with identifying students performing in the bottom quartile and selecting resource to meet students' academic, social, and emotional needs.

Person Responsible Catherine Lennard (catherine.lennard@hcps.net)

Facilitate conversations with general education and ESE teachers around the IEP goals and educational priorities for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Dustin Robinson (dustin.robinson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As students return from a strictly eLearning environment (2019 4th quarter), teachers will need to consider their social and emotional learning needs.
Measurable Outcome:	This will be monitored through attendance, mental health, and academic achievement data. Specifically, Stowers looks to decrease the number of students below 90% attendance and ensure greater access to mental health services. This combined effort will have a positive impact on student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Catherine Lennard (catherine.lennard@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School personnel will leverage parents and guardians when bridging the gap from 19-20 eLearning quarter to the 20-21 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Stowers remains committed to teaching the whole child, inclusive of their social and emotional needs. Social and emotional needs must be priority as we welcome students back to robust learning experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

School personnel will leverage parents and guardians to better understand students' social and emotional well being.

Person Responsible Dustin Robinson (dustin.robinson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Student services team will routinely communicate with school personnel and offer resources and support for students during the 20-21 school year.

Person Responsible Dustin Robinson (dustin.robinson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Statewide Science Assessment: Seek opportunities to embed science vocabulary in daily reading instruction.

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.

This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00