Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lowry Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lowry Elementary School

11505 COUNTRY HOLLOW DR, Tampa, FL 33635

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Spagnuolo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2012

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	<u>Lucinda Thompson</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo	or 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lowry Elementary School

11505 COUNTRY HOLLOW DR, Tampa, FL 33635

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID I		2021-22 Title I Schoo	l Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	No		43%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		56%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	Α		В	В

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spagnuolo, Michelle	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Ventura, Anita	Assistant Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Millan, Jessica	School Counselor	Supports students behavior and social skills.
Wetzel, Marie	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL support for Non-English speaking students.
Crump, Lindsay	Psychologist	Psychological reports and Rtl liason.
Flynn, Candice	Other	ESE Specialist-instructional leader and collaborates with ESE team. Supports students with disabilities.
Strand, Taylor	Other	School Social Worker- works with attendance and other family needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/30/2012, Michelle Spagnuolo

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

746

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

la dia stan					Grad	e Lev	/el							Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	103	115	115	123	111	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	2	19	18	23	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator						Gr	ade	Le	vel	l				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		
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

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total						
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							

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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		
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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:

ludinata.	Grade Level											Total		
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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).

Sahaal Crada Component		2022			2021		2019		
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	53%	56%				64%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						64%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						56%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	70%	50%	50%				65%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	77%						65%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	59%	59%				55%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Cor	nparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Cor	nparison	0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	52%	8%	58%	2%
Cohort Cor	nparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-60%			•	
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-69%			<u>'</u>	

			MATH	l		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	57%	19%	64%	12%
Cohort Co	mparison	-61%			'	
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Co	mparison	-76%			'	

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Com	parison					

Subgroup Data Review

		2022	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	48	50	40	48	24	16				
ELL	58	70	53	52	68	40	59				
ASN	96	96		96	96		77				
BLK	71	80		58	87						
HSP	52	60	47	55	69	48	54				
MUL	81	73		81	87						
WHT	72	73	60	79	75	40	73				
FRL	50	57	57	55	70	56	53				
		2021	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

FOOA Forders Healer	
ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	92
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	74
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	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
	0.4
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	81

Multiracial Students						
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	67					
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	57					
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO					
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0					

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We increased in proficiency in all content areas with science having the largest increase. Gains were made in both ELA and Math, with Math having the highest gains. The lowest 25% of students in math made gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our lowest 25% ELA students have 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 better identification of specific student needs and differentiation in ELA with tasks and small groups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math core instruction and science showed the most improvement in achievement and gains.

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

Team planning was increased, district math coach supported team planning, and increased the use of formative assessments during math lessons.

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

Preview of upcoming content and plan for accelerated mini-lessons.

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 plan for differentiation strategies to incorporate in instruction for all subject areas. Faculty professional development will be provided with a focus on differentiation, when applicable.

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

Progress monitoring will continue using data walls. Quarterly data chats will be conducted with classroom teachers.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The number of students making gains in the lowest 25% in ELA decreased by 12 from 67% to 55% in 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase the percentage of the lowest 25% in ELA by 6% going from 55% to 61%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be identified on our shared data walls to progress monitor during quarterly data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will use differentiation strategies to support students in ELA that are in the lowest 25%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy will allow teachers to adapt instruction to meet the specific learning needs of individual students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Grade level ELA planning, progress monitoring using district/state assessments, faculty professional development, feedback provided through classroom walk-throughs.

Person Responsible

Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The ESSA data showed that our Students with Disabilities scored below a 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities will score at or above 41% as measured by ESSA data.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data will be reviewed quarterly (FAST and STAR).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will provide differentiated instruction across all subject areas and provide accommodations in the general education classroom daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy is sot that all student can have access to general education standards while meeting individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- -walkthroughs from Administration
- -grade level PLC's and team planning
- -data chats quarterly with administration

Person Responsible

Michelle Spagnuolo (michelle.spagnuolo@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school 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 school culture and environment.

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