

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lutz K 8 School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lutz K 8 School

202 5TH AVE SE, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Phillips

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lutz K 8 School

202 5TH AVE SE, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>47%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>41%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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.

Lutz Elementary School: Building tomorrow's leaders through responsibility, effort, attitude, and leadership.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lutz Elementary: Learning Today...Leading Tomorrow

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Branham, Lori	Principal	The Leadership Team meets regularly (weekly). The purpose of the core leadership team is to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing MTSS process. At the core and intervention/enrichment level - tiers 1, 2 3 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (tiers 2/3) levels. 3.. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals in curricular and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school wide data to PLC's and facilitate problem solving within content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team meetings and PLC's.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/23/2020, Joshua Phillips

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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	93	75	92	88	96	53	75	64	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	12	9	15	8	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	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	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	85	92	103	104	95	89	73	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	12	11	6	9	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	30	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	2	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	85	92	103	104	95	89	73	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	12	11	6	9	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	30	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	2	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

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	57%	61%	72%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	59%	68%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	52%	54%	59%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	63%	55%	62%	68%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	59%	64%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	49%	52%	47%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	50%	56%	60%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
	2018	68%	53%	15%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		1%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	54%	10%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	62%	49%	13%	55%	7%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	30	25	29	40	33	32				
ELL	40	45		36	45						
BLK	21	33		29	42						
HSP	61	48	25	59	54	29	73				
MUL	67	50		57	46						
WHT	70	55	52	68	58	45	63				
FRL	51	43	33	51	48	33	52				

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	28	36	21	32	43	21					
ELL	50	67		50	42						
HSP	59	54	53	57	61	36	50				
MUL	62	50		46	60						
WHT	76	61	38	67	64	41	74				
FRL	55	52	52	48	55	32	56				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	35	71	67	30	42	31	46				
ELL	28	10		33	50						
BLK	47			47							
HSP	67	67	56	63	56	36	58				
MUL	68	59		68	59						
WHT	76	70	61	70	65	59	65				
FRL	59	60	55	53	57	48	37				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Overall Learning Gains in both ELA and Math. Need more differentiation based on specific student needs.

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

Learning Gains of Bottom Quartile ELA and Math students. Need more differentiation based on specific student needs.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Learning Gains of Bottom Quartile ELA and Math students. Need more differentiation based on specific student needs.

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

Math Proficiency. Math tutoring program established.

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

6th Grade Course failure

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

1. BQ ELA Learning Gains
2. BQ Math Learning Gains
3. Overall Learning Gains in ELA
4. Overall Learning Gains in Math
5. Course Failure Rate in Middle School

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers currently differentiate for high, middle, and low performing students; however, we need dive deeper into individual student needs. Based on data from 2019 and 2020 (FSA, I-Ready, Formatives, etc.) areas of weakness were identified to show a decrease in performance as well as overall learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency will increase by 10percentage points in both ELA and Math as measured by 2021 FSA or I-Ready diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lori Branham (lori.branham@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Throughout ELA and Math classes we are implementing a workshop model to include small group instruction based on specific needs of individual students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows students learn best in small groups with activities focused on their individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use individual data to drive instruction
2. Create common planning time with teachers and coaches
3. Use standards based instruction with rigor
4. Increase stamina and conferences
5. MTSS school-wide
6. Participate in District formatives and/or monthly common assessments in both ELA and Math

Person Responsible Lori Branham (lori.branham@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Increase ELA/Math gains for ESSA students. Focus on Learning Gains to improve student achievement and growth.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase proficiency and Learning Gains by 10 percentage points in both ELA and Math as measured by FSA, I-Ready, Monthly Common Assessments, etc.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Lori Branham (lori.branham@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Use workshop model with a focus on small group instruction to meet individual needs

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Research shows that students learn best in small groups with activities focused on their individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use data to drive instruction
2. Create common planning time with teachers and coaches
3. Use standards based instruction with rigor
4. Increase stamina and conferences
5. MTSS school-wide
6. Participate in District formatives and/or monthly common assessments in both ELA and Math

Person Responsible

Lori Branham (lori.branham@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Meet with teachers to identify students in danger of course failure and devise a plan based on individual needs in order for success. School Leadership team will meet weekly to monitor and decipher data and track student progress.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We utilize the practice of The 7 Habits of Happy Kids as a school wide culture building program. We have also become a KIND school that promotes kindness in building a positive environment for all stakeholders. Students Services have become involved in a variety of programs that promotes positivity, values, and high expectations for all stakeholders. The school provides monthly family events to promote unity, support, and involvement. Highly encourage volunteerism in our schools to include PTA, SAC tutors, mentors resulting in Golden School award.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00