

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Lowry Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 43%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (65%)<br>2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Lowry Elementary School

11505 COUNTRY HOLLOW DR, Tampa, FL 33635

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>43%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>56%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|       |         |         |         |         |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | A       |         | B       | B       |

## 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.**

2

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

1

**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:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| 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                            | 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 | 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| 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 |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | 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  |       |

**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                              | 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  |       |

**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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | 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 Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 52%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 55%      | 14%                        | 58%   | 11%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 54%      | 3%                         | 56%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |

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

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 51%      | 2%                         | 53%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 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 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 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       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| 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  |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 81  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| 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.