

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Stowers 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>

# Stowers Elementary School

13915 BARRINGTON STOWERS DR, Lithia, FL 33547

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Melanie Cochran

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (75%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (65%)
<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>	N/A
* 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>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	15%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

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
Cochrane, Melanie	Principal	Melanie Cochrane is an Instructional leader; facilitates PLCs, conducts teacher evaluations, communicates with all stakeholders, and coordinates instructional priorities
Ward, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Angela Ward is a 2nd grade teacher and serves as our SAC chair.
Sollars, Fasee	Assistant Principal	Assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of an elementary school

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/27/2022, Melanie Cochrane

**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.*

2

**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.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

58

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

900

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

22

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

22

**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	132	136	138	154	122	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	864
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	3	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	8	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	1	1	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	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 8/28/2022



**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	132	139	145	161	133	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	890
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	132	139	145	161	133	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	890
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

#### 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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	81%	53%	56%				79%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						66%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						52%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	88%	50%	50%				84%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	77%						70%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	59%	59%				73%	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	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

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	87%	54%	33%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	73%	51%	22%	53%	20%
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	54	63	56	67	65	50	46				
ELL	60	76		83	88						
ASN	80	92		88	92						
BLK	85			92							
HSP	76	69	64	82	75	54	62				
MUL	75	70		92	90						
WHT	83	70	63	89	77	73	74				
FRL	66	71	67	74	78	63	45				
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	48			56							
ELL	67	70		63	70		58				
ASN	83	63		87	88		94				
BLK	79			64							
HSP	80	80		80	64		75				
MUL	81	73		81	55		58				
WHT	84	67	71	83	72	56	80				
FRL	68	62		68	62		77				
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				

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	77
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	88
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	89
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	69
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	82
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	76
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	66
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?

FSA 2022, 2021, and 2019 showed the following:

ELA 3+  
2022 81  
2021 82  
2019 79

Math 3+  
2022 88  
2021 82  
2019 84

Science 3+  
2022 72  
2021 78  
2019 73

ELA Gains  
2022 71  
2021 70  
2019 66

Math Gains

2022 77

2021 72

2019 62

ELA BQ

2022 65

2021 67

2019 52

Math BQ

2022 68

2021 48

2019 63

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

Science and ELA

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

To increase achievement in science Stowers Elementary is utilizing formal and informational data to provide targeted instruction.

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

Math BQ (Bottom Quartile)

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

The improvements in Math BQ (bottom quartile) are representative of academic interventions targeting specific math strategies.

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

In order to accelerate learning, Stowers Elementary School is committed to using academic performance data to inform the planning purpose. Additionally, grade level and curriculum team meet regularly to discuss instructional delivery models and interventions that target specific academic areas.

**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.**

School wide "How Learning Works" book study, Grade level PLC's for data, professional growth, and academic planning.

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

Sustainability of improvement is critical in all academic areas. A crucial component of improvement is consistency in effective instructional delivery models. Stowers is committed to promoting equitable instructional practices tied to grade level standards.

### **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 Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

When comparing the 2021 and 2022 FSA science assessment scores, science proficiency decreased from 78 to 72. Instructional practice will focus on supporting a teacher's ability to plan and implement high-quality standards-based lessons which focus on instructional delivery practices requiring students to do the cognitive lift

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Stowers Elementary School will increase FSA science proficiency to an 80%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area will be monitored through district and classroom assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Fasee Sollars (fasee.sollars@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

1. Support the development of standards-based lesson plans and promote collaboration and gradual release of responsibility to the students.
2. Support the implementation of high-quality lesson plans, instructional best practices and teacher clarity.
3. Analyze, discuss, and reflect on student work, common assessments, and instructional practices to develop high-quality standards-based lesson plans.

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

Students will be intellectually engaged in standards-based learning that will meet the needs of all students. PLCs will provide teachers with the necessary skills, strategies, and support that will help develop and execute high-quality instruction. Instructional practice will focus on supporting a teacher's ability to plan and implement high-quality standards-based lessons which focus on instructional delivery practices requiring students to do the cognitive lift

**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.

Meet with individual teams to discuss science data and identify gaps in learning and instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Melanie Cochran (melanie.cochrane@hcps.net)

Provide professional development books and resources that support standards-based instruction. School wide book study on "How Learning Works".

**Person Responsible**

Fasee Sollars (fasee.sollars@hcps.net)

Adjust 5th grade AGP teacher schedule to be the science teacher of record teaching the science core instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Melanie Cochran (melanie.cochrane@hcps.net)

Administration will conduct walkthroughs and fidelity checks to provide ongoing feedback.

**Person Responsible**

Melanie Cochran (melanie.cochrane@hcps.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

## **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.**

Stowers Elementary School uses a variety of responses to build a positive school culture and environment. Stowers Elementary schools employs a positive behavior system ticket system that rewards students for demonstrating S.T.A.R (Safety, Take Responsibility, Attitude, Respect) behavior. All tickets are then placed in a basket for a weekly drawing and associate prize.

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

Melanie Cochrane, principal; Fasee Sollars, AP; Amanda Edinger, school counselor, Danielle Ackerman, school counselor