Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lutz K 8 School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lutz K 8 School

202 5TH AVE SE, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	43%

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

School Grades History

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

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Phillips, Joshua	Principal	Principal Lutz K8
Alsum, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	TTD 1/2 and ELA 5th 1/2

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, 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.*
1

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
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
700

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	90	102	84	93	84	75	49	69	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	8	25	20	13	18	16	14	7	12	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	5	14	24	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	21	12	12	9	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	14	24	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	64

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	1	0	1	1	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	0	2	0	7	1	1	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 10/5/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	57%	61%	68%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	59%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	52%	54%	42%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				63%	55%	62%	62%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	59%	62%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	49%	52%	37%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				62%	50%	56%	67%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	77%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math Grades 1-5
Middle School Achieve and Form Data

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	68%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	57%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	58%	68%	76%
	English Language Learners	43%	50%	85%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	73%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	53%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	43%	57%
	English Language Learners			20%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	88%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	55%	76%
	Students With Disabilities	37%	63%	71%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	53%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	39%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	60%	70%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75%	87%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	73%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	70%	74%	94%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	51%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	27%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	49%	57%	75%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	76%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45%	52%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	64%	67%	76%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	57%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	20%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	65%	79%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79%	84%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59%	65%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	83%	86%	96%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	69%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	42%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	54%	73%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	78.50%		79.46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.70%		50.34%
	Students With Disabilities	87.25		78.64
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38%	53%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	13%	12.5%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	55%	56%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35%		57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%		43%
	Students With Disabilities	47%		55%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	54%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	19%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	65%	37%	49%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39%		57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%		47%
	Students With Disabilities	36%		50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	63%		75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%		54%
	Students With Disabilities	49%		75%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	55%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	40%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	50%	60%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61%		56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%		46%
	Students With Disabilities	37%		60%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63%		75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%		54%
	Students With Disabilities	49%		75%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	25	33	18	28	48	46	27	50			
ELL	31	27		34	60	45	20				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	13			20							
HSP	53	59	27	54	62	48	51	76	80		
MUL	88	67		69	67						
WHT	63	63	35	66	58	32	72	72	86		
FRL	46	52	33	49	56	41	53	67	65		

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	31	30	25	29	40	33	32				
ELL	40	45		36	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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across grade levels, our economically disadvantaged students performed at or near other subgroups for certain grade levels, but third grade shows a need for growth and sixth grade economically disadvantaged students performed significantly below their grade level peers. Middle school economically disadvantaged students are performing below their grade level peers. Grade 5 science economically disadvantaged dropped from the beginning of the year to the end of the year in proficiency. 8th grade reading stayed stagnant with proficiency throughout the school year. 8th grade math showed a decrease in proficiency from fall to spring.L

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

The bottom quartile shows the largest need for improvement based on the 2019 FSA scores as only 36% of students in our bottom quartile showed learning gains. Math learning gains overall dropped by 7% in 2019. 8th grade math students in 2020 progress monitoring showed a 5% decrease throughout the school year.

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

Lack of foundational skills and the pandemic were contributing factors to the decrease in grade 8. The bottom quartile decreases were due to a lack of progress monitoring in the area of math and stronger differentiation in math. To move forward, intense progress monitoring, skill based lessons, acceleration, and instructional based small groups need to be implemented to address these needs for improvement.

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

Math proficiency for the whole school showed a 1% increase in proficiency. First through fifth grade math showed the greatest proficiency according to the 2020 progress monitoring data. Civics showed a 12% increase. Sixth, seventh, and eight grade reading showed increases of around 20% in proficiency on progress monitoring.

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

Grades K-5 used i-Ready for specific individual instruction in the areas of reading of reading and math and in reading it was part of their curriculum. Grades K-8 utilized Brainspring for students with disabilities that needed targeted specific instruction. Grades 3-8 utilized Achieve 3000 for specific

instruction in the area of reading. Grades 6-8 utilized Brightfish for specific gaps in reading for students.

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

All grade levels will have data monitoring meetings with administration and coaches and planning sessions with coaches. Small group instruction will be utilized daily in all grade levels and academic areas. There will be a focus on district created instructional calendars to meet all curriculum needs and teachers will have access to acceleration resources.

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.

Monthly ILT meeting with instructional leaders looking at grade level data which will provide opportunities for discussions regarding strategies and action plans for improvement. Grade level data chats and PLC's to identify individual and grade level student needs. Content specific vertical action teams will be present on school site to create action plans for each academic subject area. Each grade level will be represented to help support the curriculum subject area in improvement.

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

Administrative walkthroughs and feedback cycles and regular planning with coaches and grade level teams. Monthly job embedded professional development will be available for staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will have a focus on rigorous core instruction and ensure the fidelity of small group, differentiated instruction, and acceleration in all content areas
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our subgroup performance for students with disabilities and African American students to improve beyond the state expectation of an overall 41. We will work to increase the bottom quartile by 15% during this school year.
Monitoring:	We will have progress monitoring count sheets and grade level data meetings with administration and support staff. Action plans will be created to monitor our bottom quartile throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group and differentiated instruction, standard based lessons and lesson plans, ILT, MTSS, Regular data meetings, administrative feedback to staff, and goal setting with teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When these school wide systems are in place, research shows it allows opportunities for increases in student engagement and achievement

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly PLC's with grade levels and or content specific meetings and data meetings with coaches and administration

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Vertical subject area content teams developing an action plan around improvement of the content area

Person Responsible	Melanie Alsum (melanie.alsum@hcps.net)

Grade level RTI/ MTSS progress monitoring meetings

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

On site professional development

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Student goal setting with students and staff and administration goal setting with students throughout the year

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current behavior committee had action plans and areas for positive student incentives, but they were not being implemented with fidelity school-wide.
Measurable Outcome:	We will have a PAW Pride behavior committee that will work to identify positive behavior incentives inside and outside the classroom and set expectations for classroom behavior, lunchroom behavior, etc. Students will be awarded PAW bucks to utilize as rewards and participate in positive based incentives regarding behavior. We will also develop a staff based culture committee to analyze student survey and staff survey data to create an action plan for improvement.
Monitoring:	We will regularly monitor discipline data monthly during administrative meetings and also analyze the increase in students responding to our positive behavior incentives as they are implemented to support both elementary and middle school students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize a PBIS system to support student needs through the PAW Pride committee
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that a positive based intervention helps to decrease disruptive behaviors and can contribute to an increase in overall student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a culture committee and redesign the Paw Pride committee to ensure all grade levels and student services are represented when making action steps for implementation

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Create action plans for Paw behavior expectations in various locations of the school

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Develop more opportunities for student leadership on campus through student government and the implementation of the National Elementary Honor Society.

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 44% in grade four scored at proficiency, which is a level 3 or higher. This score was due to over 50% of students one or more grade levels below in reading, lack of teacher clarity, and continuous rigorous instruction in the ELA instructional block. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include instruction with rigorous tasks at or above complexity level expected for the grade, small group instruction, frequent monitoring of student levels and reading abilities, and feedback given to teachers on core rigorous instruction through walkthroughs. These steps will help create an improvement in student proficiency on grade 4 FSA ELA in 2022.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of fourth grade students scoring at a 3 or above on the FSA ELA assessment will increase to 55% as measured by progress monitoring tools and the FSA ELA assessment in 2022.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through data chats, classroom walkthroughs, RTI/ MTSS meetings with the grade level, and through planning sessions with administration. We will also aggressively monitor data as an administrative team by utilizing i-Ready, ELA minis, and other district created assessments to monitor student performance on ELA tests in order to prepare for the grade 4 FSA ELA assessment in 2022.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will work to improve the accuracy and alignment of the daily learning target so that it is standards aligned and grade level appropriate in order to drive instruction and create an environment of rigorous core instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We want to be ensure that student learning tasks are aligned to the grade level appropriate standards and also analyze if core instruction is rigorous to create opportunities for productive student struggle which helps increase engagement. .

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze student and grade level data with teachers and leadership team

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Conduct beginning of the year data chats to review data with teachers and create an action plan for improvement with grade 4 teachers and to monitor progress of all subgroups.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Truman (tiffany.truman@hcps.net)

Conduct ongoing grade level data chats, focused collaborative planning sessions, and classroom walkthrough feedback to progress monitor and create next steps. Subgroup progress will be monitored and incorporated in our school data count sheets to be analyzed regularly.

Person Responsible	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

At Lutz K-8 School we had an average of 2.4 student incidences per 100 students. We do currently serve EBD students on site grades K-5 which contribute to a higher level of incidences. Our focus will be to decrease disruptive behavior through our positive behavior committee

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.

During ILT, we will provide a space for grade levels to share concerns and areas of improvement that may impact their grade level. We will also have a school culture committee that will analyze student culture results and staff culture results which will allow us to address deficits and create an action plan on improvement for students and staff. The PAW Pride committee will help with ensuring students feel a sense of pride coming to school and we can use the PAW expectations when attempting to address student behavior concerns.

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

Administration will work with ILT, the Culture Committee, and the Paw Pride committee to monitor implementation and regularly plan next steps as needed.

Students will be part of student government to help make decisions at school and the culture committee members will be teachers helping to implement solutions to areas of weaknesses of our surveys.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00