Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lutz K 8 School

2022-23 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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.](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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	48%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

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 K-8 School: Building tomorrow's leaders through responsibility, effort, attitude, and leadership.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lutz K-8 School: Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow

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
Alsum, Melanie	Reading Coach	Support instruction in classrooms.
Phillips, Joshua	Principal	Support Lutz K-8 in all areas.
Truman, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Support Lutz K-8 in all areas.
Alwood, Andy	Assistant Principal	Support Lutz K-8 in all areas.
White, Tabitha	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Joshua Phillips

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.*
6

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

710

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

3

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

4

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	42	53	90	97	74	83	79	77	49	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	14	18	6	11	14	12	4	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	2	1	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	21	16	18	10	11	8	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	13	15	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	3	0	15	12	12	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	6	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Wednesday 7/20/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	63%	51%	55%				65%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						51%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						36%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	72%	41%	42%				63%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%						56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						36%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	61%	48%	54%				62%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	57%	59%					77%	78%

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	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2022					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2022					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	27	47	46	38	55	43	32				
ELL	46	73	62	42	57	42					
BLK	31	67		31	67						
HSP	61	57	44	65	69	58	59	67	86		
MUL	71	60		69							
WHT	64	60	46	77	77	64	64	81	87		
FRL	46	54	38	60	68	54	44	71	93		

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	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		

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				

				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
MUL	67	50		57	46						
WHT	70	55	52	68	58	45	63				
FRL	51	43	33	51	48	33	52				

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	66
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	657
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	54
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	62
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	67
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	69
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	58
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?

Overall Lutz K-8's Math profiency and gains out perform ELA. Lutz K-8's Math bottom quartile out performs our ELA bottom quartile. Science showed the highest drop in profiency. Our students will disabilities and ELL subgroups underperformed as compared to other subgroups within our school.

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

The greatest need for improvement is 5th grade Science, 7th grade Mathematics and our ELA bottom quartile.

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

The continuous monitoring from the Math Monthly assessments contributed to the high gains in this category. Also, a continuous monitoring and focus of the bottom quartile during the monthly leadership meetings contributed to this. New actions would be to analyze what instruction is taking place with our ELA bottom quartile students to determine a plan of action. Providing 7th grade with different opportunities such as tutoring and more frequent small group instruction.

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

The most improvement at Lutz K-8 included Math bottom quartile going from 40% to 60%, ELA bottom quartile went from 32% to 46%, and Math learning gains went from 59% to 75%.

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

The continuous monitoring from the Math Monthly assessments contributed to the high gains in this category.

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

We are revising are tutoring implementation and a more targeted focus on small group instruction.

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.

We will provide an aggressing monitoring implementation with additional support on the break down of differentiation.

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

We will have our reading coach providing coaching cycles, data digs with each grade every 6 weeks, monthly MTSS meetings with each grade level, leadership meetings to disaggregate school data and bi-monthly PLC's.

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Focus on rigorous core instruction and ensure fidelity of small group, differentiated instruction, and acceleration to help foster academic engagement of all students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Lutz K-8 will maintain or improve proficiency in both ELA and Mathematics by 10% as well as improve bottom quartile in both ELA and Mathematics by 15% as measured by FAST in May of 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will be monitoring individual teacher and grade level data within Core Leadership and Leadership meetings. RTI/MTSS interventions and problem solving meetings to discuss progress throughout the year. A focus on small group and differentiation with focus on walkthroughs and feedback. Monthly bottom quartile progress breakdown brought by team leaders for discussion. Regular data chats, PLC's and regular coaching to monitor instructional practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small group instruction to target areas of need for students, RTI/MTSS intervention and progress monitoring to adapt instruction for students and collaborative PLC's for content and grade level teachers to disaggregate data and plan for future instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	All strategies listed were utilized for the 2021-2022 school year and were proven to increase student achievement.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

An area of focus for K-2 will be meaningful and rigorous students tasks during ELA instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

An area of focus for 3-5 will be differentiation strategies delivered via small group based on data, and goal setting data based student conferences throughout the year.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our proficiency in ELA will increase by 10% and bottom quartile by 15% as measured by FAST by May 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our proficiency in ELA will increase by 10% and bottom quartile by 15% as measured by FAST by May 2023.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring will happen through walkthrough feedback and consistent PLC's.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Phillips, Joshua, joshua.phillips@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Small group instruction throughout the year, and SIPPS/Wonders utilization in K-2 to target foundational skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Research shows that small group instruction provides students with differentiated and targeted instruction targeted to their individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The first action step to be implemented is professional development for aggressive monitoring of student instruction. How are teachers monitoring progress in between data points to help in tracking progress? The second action step to be implemented is all teachers will participate in coaching cycles.	Phillips, Joshua, joshua.phillips@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 culture with Lutz K-8 is enhanced with the implementation of a school wide behavior and and cafeteria plan and committee. The school utilizes PAW bucks to reward positive behaviors, implementation of SEL curriculum, use of student mentors/buddies for other students, and outside mentors.

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

The student services team as well as the leadership team meet regularly to discuss the implementations of the programs and help to problem solve throughout the year together to provide success to all programs.