

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Buckhorn Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Buckhorn Elementary School

2420 BUCKHORN SCHOOL CT, Valrico, FL 33594

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Corrie Heidt

Start Date for this Principal: 3/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Buckhorn Elementary School

2420 BUCKHORN SCHOOL CT, Valrico, FL 33594

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a learning environment where students feel motivated to achieve to the best of their abilities in order to become successful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learners today. Leaders tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brooks, Tamara	Principal	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Martin, Kyley	Teacher, K-12	AGP Teacher/ SAC Chair ~Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Horn, Tara	Assistant Principal	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Kieffer, Sara	Instructional Coach	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Anderson, Melissa	School Counselor	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Allen, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist ~Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 3/1/2009, Corrie Heidt

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.*

6

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	98	116	110	111	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	7	10	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	123	126	111	121	134	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	16	11	8	9	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	123	126	111	121	134	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	16	11	8	9	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	52%	57%	68%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	55%	58%	67%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	54%	63%	71%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	62%	70%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	46%	51%	59%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	50%	53%	70%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	67%	53%	14%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	55%	15%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
	2018	73%	57%	16%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	51%	14%	53%	12%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	52	49	41	48	50	34				
ELL	43	47	33	55	63	54	50				
ASN	69	67		81	83						
BLK	52	64		52	55						
HSP	57	53	44	64	60	43	54				
MUL	64	59		76	65						
WHT	68	66	63	63	55	40	70				
FRL	57	61	61	53	55	43	58				
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	32	49	45	41	52	36	52				
ELL	41	47		50	50						
ASN	75	67		81	92						
BLK	45	53		45	60		30				
HSP	60	57	39	66	61	46	58				
MUL	68	54		88	85						
WHT	66	60	57	78	76	52	88				

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
FRL	56	57	55	63	63	36	64				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	64	67	44	52	50					
ELL	26			35							
ASN	60			73							
BLK	52	56		52	63						
HSP	58	51	37	58	65	53	60				
MUL	77			77							
WHT	74	75	72	77	74	65	80				
FRL	53	59	50	49	60	42	45				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	53
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	54
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	66
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	61
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The bottom quartile performance in Math has been the lowest. This is a trend due to the performance the prior year.

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

Math learning gains dropped 14 percentage points. Training of teachers during the gap year contributed to this decline.

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.

The bottom quartile for Math, where we were six percentage points below the state average. A unique cohort of students contributed to this trend.

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

The bottom quartile for ELA grew 6 percentage points to 55 percent in 2019. This trend was continued during the 19-20 school year on iReady.

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

We had 27 primary age students with attendance that fell below 90 percent.

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

1. Increase bottom quartile gains in Mathematics.
2. Increase overall learning gains in Mathematics.
3. Continue growth of bottom quartile learning gains in ELA.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The goal for Buckhorn is that 100% of our students will make learning gains over the 2020-2021 school year. Our specific target area is our learners in Mathematics. Our bottom quartile gains in ELA and Math were 55% and 45% respectively. Therefore we will focus on planning for rigorous differentiation in order for all students, especially in Math, to make learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will make at least a one point gain in one or more areas of instruction as measured by the FSA or iReady administered in the spring of 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement high-yield strategies to increase achievement through "Visible Learning" (Fisher, Frye, Hattie) 2. Explore rigorous small group options with supported lesson planning. 3. Monitor RtI/MTSS Tier 2 and 3 implementation for fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rigorous small group structures encourage student talk and active engagement in learning. Supporting lesson planning through our PLC's will ensure alignment to the rigor of the standards and incorporation of appropriate collaborative strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for teachers with the book: "Visible Learning".
2. Ensure a schedule is created to allow teacher teams to have PLC time for planning.
3. Use multiple data points to monitor learning and drive differentiation within instruction.
4. Use bi-weekly walkthroughs by leadership team to monitor use of small groups and collaborative structures while they implement lessons aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We have a variety of activities established through our SAC and PTA to engage our stakeholders, including several academically-themed evenings. We communicate with parents through our monthly newsletter, through our established conference nights, our social media pages and through our school website. Teachers establish regular communication with parents regarding student academic progress.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00