Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lutz K 8 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lutz K 8 School

202 5TH AVE SE, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Phillips, Joshua	Principal	Instructional leader and manager
Alwood, Andy	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader and manager
Truman, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader and manager
White, Tabitha	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher and SAC Chair

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We utilize input from student government and our SAC team as well as teachers and administrators on new initiatives and focuses that are centered around student need

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will monitor through the use of our instructional priorities and monitor effectiveness during monthly leadership meetings

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	18	19	9	15	16	13	8	125
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	6	8	4	5	6	35
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	18	24	14	11	14	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	19	8	5	12	0	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	25	13	11	15	16	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	21	8	5	11	6	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	5	8	1	3	8	12	14	9	62
	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	6	13	8	10	7	47

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	14	18	6	11	14	12	4	88
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	2	1	0	1	4	5	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	16	18	10	11	8	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	13	15	6	8	5	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	3	0	15	12	12	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	14	18	6	11	14	12	4	88
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	2	1	0	1	4	5	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	16	18	10	11	8	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	13	15	6	8	5	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	3	0	15	12	12	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	58	51	53	63	51	55	60		
ELA Learning Gains				60			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			32		
Math Achievement*	69	50	55	72	41	42	61		
Math Learning Gains				75			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			40		
Science Achievement*	64	48	52	61	48	54	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	65	68	77	57	59	73		
Middle School Acceleration	90	70	70	87	51	51	84		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	83	52	55	56	73	70	68		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	657
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	62			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	62			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	58			69			64	77	90			83
SWD	26			42			22	40			5	
ELL	44			58			57				4	83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			38							2	
HSP	54			60			52	71			6	91
MUL	56			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	61			74			70	84	90		6	
FRL	43			56			53	68	86		7	80

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	60	46	72	75	60	61	77	87			56
SWD	27	47	46	38	55	43	32					
ELL	46	73	62	42	57	42						56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	67		31	67							
HSP	61	57	44	65	69	58	59	67	86			54
MUL	71	60		69								
PAC												
WHT	64	60	46	77	77	64	64	81	87			
FRL	46	54	38	60	68	54	44	71	93			50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	60	32	61	59	40	65	73	84			68
SWD	25	33	18	28	48	46	27	50				
ELL	31	27		34	60	45	20					68
AMI												
ASN	80			80								
BLK	13			20								
HSP	53	59	27	54	62	48	51	76	80			75
MUL	88	67		69	67							
PAC												
WHT	63	63	35	66	58	32	72	72	86			
FRL	46	52	33	49	56	41	53	67	65			67

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	47%	18%	47%	18%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	47%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	47%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	46%	14%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	25%	36%	-11%	48%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	61%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	55%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	53%	24%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	41%	12%	44%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	51%	18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	55%	39%	50%	44%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	64%	13%	66%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA showed the lowest performance across subject areas, with one grade level showing a double-digit loss. Most grade levels dropped slightly with third grade showing the highest increase for the school. Factors contributing to this were new standards and uneven instructional practices across grade levels to ensure the depth of the standard is met.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline moving down 6% from the prior school year. See above for contributing factors.

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.

Although we are ahead of the state in all components, we are on par with the state for 4th grade reading. We are working to ensure grade level teachers work consistently now that we have two ELA teachers in 4th grade.

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

While our overall proficiency stayed the same in science, our 5th grade science showed the most improvement with an 19% increase. We participated in targeted supports and had data chats as well as planning sessions with teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two areas of concern from the early warning systems would be students with discipline data and amount of students who are a level 1 in reading or math that will make up our bottom quartile.

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

Monitor our bottom quartile and low performing students regularly
Ensure a focus is placed on instructional priorities and rigorous instruction
Monitor subgroups for performance throughout the school year
Implement a HOUSE system to support behaviors and academics at school
Attendance plan to decrease absences and tardies

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Over the past two school years, our discipline data for students has increased and behaviors have intensified in the classroom and around the school environment. We will implement a school house system to help positively reinforce behaviors and a positive learning environment among students and staff.

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

With the implementation of a school house system, we will decrease the number of school based referrals by 50% throughout each quarter.

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

Quarterly at leadership meetings we will review discipline and grade level discipline data to determine if the plan is having success across the school environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will utilize the model similar to Ron Clark Academy where we implement Dens (Houses) for students and staff. Students will be placed in their respective dens, and they earn points for academic learning time as well as unstructured opportunities on campus. Point systems will be appropriate for both elementary and middle school students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have staff on site who have worked in schools using the HOUSE system and shared successes. We have discussed and seen models of this prior to implementation in order to problem-solve around how to implement successfully.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 as a committee to design the HOUSE system that would be relevant for our school and develop a point system and ways in which points will be tracked. We will problem-solve around celebrations and next steps for implementation.

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

By When: September 2023

Place signage around school and create teacher buy-in by reviewing discipline data to create a sense of urgency.

Person Responsible: Andy Alwood (andy.alwood@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023

Implementation of HOUSE system and monitoring of points as well as school-wide celebrations and tracking of discipline

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

By When: September 2023 and quarterly throughout the school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A focus on standards based instruction in all classroom settings to ensure instruction both in whole group and small group is differentiated, rigorous, and meeting the depth of the standard.

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

In ELA, we will want to increase proficiency by 3% for the 2023-2024 school year. Math proficiency will increase by 3% as well as science and civics. Bottom quartile proficiency will be at 50% or higher with implementation of strong standards-based instruction.

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

Monthly at Instructional Leadership Team meetings where we review grade level data trends and continuous monitoring of the bottom quartile. Regular PLC's and data chats with grade levels and subject areas will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

District approved benchmark and standards based instructional practices as well as contunuous support from our reading coach and ongoing progress monitoring of student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have found that when there is a focus on standards-based instruction that reaches the depth of the standard, students are exposed to high level content that meets their needs and translates to student success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Review prior year data with whole school and grade level teams as well as conduct data chats with grade levels to identify strengths, barriers, and next steps for instruction and professional development.

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

By When: August 2023 and ongoing

Grade level teams/ subject areas develop a plan of action on addressing instruction and monitoring data through PLC's.

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

By When: August 2023 and ongoing monthly

Review data trends after grade level assessments and modify instructional needs as necessary. Offer professional development to support classroom needs and provide coaching support.

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

By When: September 2023

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our students with disabilities have performed under all other ESSA groups in our school. We will work monthly to monitor the progress of students with disabilities along with the bottom quartile and meet with VE teachers to discuss trends across academic instructional time with varying grade level students.

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

50% of students with disabilities will show improvement in their FAST/ STAR scores throughout the school year and through district progress monitoring tools.

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

We will meet with VE teachers quarterly and with grade level and ESE department monthly to review academic trends and supports necessary to ensure success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Phillips (joshua.phillips@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use Brainspring instruction and standards- based instructional practices as well as common planning with VE teachers and general education teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Brainspring has shown success with students with disabilities, and we want teachers to review data together as well as plan for instruction that is complimentary of classroom instruction to meet the needs of individual students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 VE teachers, ESE specialist, and gen ed teachers to discuss ESSA and needs of monitoring of our students who have disabilities and create an action plan.

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

By When: August 2023

Meet monthly as a leadership team and VE teachers meet with grade levels for PLC's to review data and plan instruction that aligns to the standards and needs of students.

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

By When: September 2023

VE team meets with admin and ESE specialist quarterly to review trends and needs and VE team meets with ESE specialist every six weeks to discuss needs of VE team, support, and trends with instruction.

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

By When: August 2023 and ongoing.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

-

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

-

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

-

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

-

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

-

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

-

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

-

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

-

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes