

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lowry 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

Lowry Elementary School

11505 COUNTRY HOLLOW DR, Tampa, FL 33635

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Spagnuolo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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)	43%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Lowry Elementary School

11505 COUNTRY HOLLOW DR, Tampa, FL 33635

[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	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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.

Lowry Elementary will create a positive learning community where students achieve academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lowry Elementary will provide all students with the rigor, knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

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
Spagnuolo, Michelle	Principal	School Administrator
Ventura, Anita	Assistant Principal	School Administrator
Millan, Jessica	School Counselor	School Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Michelle Spagnuolo

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.*

4

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

724

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

1

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

1

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	107	120	119	106	108	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	35	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	20	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	35	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 8/26/2021

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	111	118	114	120	144	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	7	9	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	111	118	114	120	144	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	7	9	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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				64%	52%	57%	65%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	55%	58%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	54%	63%	66%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	57%	62%	58%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	51%	39%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	50%	53%	58%	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	60%	52%	8%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	57%	19%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady data is used for the progress monitoring tool for 1st -5th grades. 5th grade science baseline/ midyear/summative is used for progress monitoring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	72	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	60	69
	Students With Disabilities	49	69	75
	English Language Learners	23	54	79
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	59	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	44	66
	Students With Disabilities	38	76	89
	English Language Learners	3	43	60

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	74	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	43	61
	Students With Disabilities	61	60	63
	English Language Learners	34	48	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37	64	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	43	61
	Students With Disabilities	43	61	73
	English Language Learners	22	47	47

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73	76	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	62	66
	Students With Disabilities	77	81	86
	English Language Learners	50	45	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	49	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	30	49
	Students With Disabilities	49	60	87
	English Language Learners	15	21	32

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	77	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	68	81
	Students With Disabilities	48	59	66
	English Language Learners	56	53	63
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	54	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	47	76
	Students With Disabilities	27	40	59
	English Language Learners	25	29	72
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	75	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	68	75
	Students With Disabilities	65	71	74
	English Language Learners	50	61	79
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	47	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	34	61
	Students With Disabilities	45	42	62
	English Language Learners	20	42	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	59	65	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	41	
	Students With Disabilities	62	63	
	English Language Learners	17	39	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	18	35		24	31		8				
ELL	46	63	70	56	75		48				
ASN	82	75		85	67		69				
BLK	47	62		43	58		27				
HSP	54	58	60	57	67	43	52				
MUL	72			72			50				
WHT	71	67		73	54		66				
FRL	47	54	65	54	61	43	45				
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	21	41	44	27	48	35	15				
ELL	61	65	65	69	68	57	30				
ASN	81	71		88	79		53				
BLK	45	64		45	61	42	50				
HSP	56	61	60	56	57	48	42				
MUL	71	73		57	55						
WHT	67	63	50	68	68	50	67				
FRL	48	56	48	47	51	39	37				
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	24	30	31	29	49	39	18				
ELL	49	42	48	62	74	63	15				
ASN	80	63		87	75						
BLK	53	57		43	38		25				
HSP	57	48	29	58	53	44	49				
MUL	70	53		61	65						
WHT	70	46	35	74	60	33	67				
FRL	55	48	43	57	54	38	50				

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	76
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	47
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	59
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	65
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	66
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	55
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?

ELA had improvements in all areas which include achievement level, learning gains, and bottom quartile. In most grade levels, ELL students had less proficiency on spring iReady. The number of students that are proficient that made learning gains in math decreased from 2019-2021. Science stayed the same.

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

The overall math achievement and learning gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Our contributing factors consist of lack of rigorous tasks given to students and allowing students to productively struggle.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is achievement gains and bottom quartile in ELA.

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

Teachers consistently collaborated during planning sessions to build content knowledge. They also met one-on one with our Reading coach to disaggregate data and plan for areas on need. The school also purchased the iReady Phonics for Reading for grades 3-5 to address foundational skills in the intermediate grades.

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

Teachers will need to use the Prerequisite Math Assessment to help identify opportunities for acceleration or front loading math concepts.

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.

Grade levels will meet with the District Math Resource teacher to identify timing for acceleration and the instructional math materials to use. Other PD will include what acceleration looks like in each content area.

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

ELP tutoring for below level students, curriculum nights which include ELA and STEAM, and FSA boot camp prior to testing.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We decreased our number of math achievement and learning gains by 3%.
Measurable Outcome:	Lowry will increase proficiency and learning gains from 62% to 67% measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	We will use math monthly data to progress monitor and identify areas of remediation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Exit tickets and assessment data will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy will allow teachers to progress monitor by looking at student's work and identify areas of need.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade Level team planning sessions are held weekly for Math.
 Classroom walk-through feedback will be provided by administrators. (On occasion by Math District Resource Teachers).
 Three hour planning sessions will be provided to intermediate grades by the district Math resource teacher.
 Progress monitoring through the districts math monthlies.

Person Responsible Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)

ESSA Subgroup action steps-
 ESE teachers will meet bi-monthly to share data and identify areas of support and trends.
 District and school level PD that service SWD students to improve achievement.
 ESE site-based specialist will provide coaching support to all teachers that service SWD students.

Person Responsible Candice Flynn (candice.flynn@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.

Lowry Elementary, compared to the state, is ranked lower. We are ranked as moderate. Our total incidents per 100 students is 0.56. Our suspension rate for 2019-2020 is very low. We will monitor Bullying incidents by incorporating Bullying lessons in the classroom by school counselors.

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.

The schools plans to build positive relationships with students, staff and community by having a clear vision for our school. We will create meaningful parent involvement by generating clear and open communication, continue to encourage parents to participate in school-wide events including parent/teacher conferences, and ensure students feel safe, supported, respected, and valued in their environment.

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

Stakeholders included: Michelle Spagnuolo-Principal, Anita Ventura-Assistant Principal, Jessica Carris-School Counselor, Marley Opila-School Counselor, Candice Flynn-ESE Specialist, Lindsay Crump-School Psychologist, and Taylor Strand-Social Worker.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
			Total:
			\$0.00