
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Schwarzkopf Elementary School

18333 CALUSA TRACE BLVD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pamela Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 2/15/2007

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)	43%
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: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Schwarzkopf Elementary School

18333 CALUSA TRACE BLVD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

Building Communication
 Enhancing Culture
 Active Engagement
 Revolutionary Instruction

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating innovative minds for the future.

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
Holley, Cheryl	Principal	HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.
Beltran, Lizzette	Teacher, K-12	ELL Resource, Reading Resource, SITE Resource, Attend district meetings/ training monthly, Assist teachers with planning and instructional implementation support, Oversee the ELL para professional, Analyze school wide data to drive instruction forward
Caro, Lori	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 2/15/2007, Pamela Wilkins

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.*

5

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

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)	43%
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: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	90	86	83	113	111	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/25/2020

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	90	85	84	112	112	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	2	7	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	85	84	112	112	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	2	7	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	52%	57%	78%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	75%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	60%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	54%	63%	75%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	89%	57%	62%	77%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	46%	51%	59%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	50%	53%	78%	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	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
	2018	77%	53%	24%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	54%	25%	62%	17%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%
	2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	89%	54%	35%	60%	29%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	52%	20%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	36	38	29	58	79	79	25				
ELL	61	62	53	71	97	95	40				
ASN	82	80		94	100						
BLK	57	46		71	69						
HSP	72	70	59	76	88	83	55				
MUL	100	71		96	100						
WHT	79	55	37	87	88	64	83				
FRL	71	69	57	79	87	76	59				
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	51	62	63	40	62	44					
ELL	56	52	42	53	64	57					
ASN	74	43		84	79						
BLK	76	85		65	62						
HSP	72	56	48	67	77	69	71				
MUL	89	67		89	100						
WHT	81	62	61	82	80	63	83				
FRL	68	61	53	67	78	69	66				
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	38	53	46	41	60	54					
ELL	47	69		50	59	40	42				
ASN	94			88							
BLK	88			71	80						
HSP	68	75	55	65	73	56	65				
MUL	94			75							
WHT	81	73	58	80	78	61	81				
FRL	70	74	61	65	76	52	73				

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	72
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	576
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	68
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	89
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	61
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	72

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	92
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	70
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	70
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.

Lowest quartile, especially in the content area of ELA. We had noticed that guided reading had not been consistent among grade level.

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

ESE learning gains, ESE teachers were consistently pulling students out of the classroom, rather than fusing in with grade level teachers.

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.

ELA bottom quartile. Although we were above the state average, it was very minimal and we believe it was because of the lack of consistency with guided reading in all grade levels.

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

Math learning gains, We had implemented small group instruction in all classrooms, focused on foundational skills and we started using iredy more frequently.

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

*ESE learning gains

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

1. Align standards based lessons with appropriately rigorous tasks, common language, and assessments.
2. Guided Reading and small group math instruction.
3. Infuse foundational skills, spiral reviews, and evidence based learning in content areas.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Align standards based lessons with appropriately rigorous tasks, common instructional language, and assessments.

Measurable Outcome: There will be significant increase in assessments both district and state wide improvement in math and especially reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: *formal and informal walkthroughs
*formal and informal observations

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Frequent formal observations, informal observations, and walk-throughs will help hold teachers accountable for implementing standards based lessons, the continual use of common language, and the use of appropriately rigorous tasks and assessments that directly align with the standards being taught.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Guided Reading and small group math instruction\ *ELA bottom quartile data declined *Guided reading was not consistent in all classrooms *data shows a need for small group instruction in ELA, and that it small group instruction in Math is effective.
Measurable Outcome:	*formal and informal walk-throughs *Observation data *Iready data *ILT/PLC data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*formal and informal observations *walk-throughs
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent formal observations, informal observations, and walk throughs will hold teachers accountable for implementing and holding small group with fidelity in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Iready data shows the need for vocabulary and phonemic awareness along with ILT input across all grade levels
Measurable Outcome:	Iready data will increase in the areas of foundational skills.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*RTI groups *mad minutes *computer based programs *spiral review
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through conversation with teachers in PLC's and in our ILT's, work samples, FSA data, Iready data, there is a need for foundational skills to be embedded at all levels in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- *Faculty PLC breakout sessions with exemplar teacher leaders
- *Peer coaching and team walk-throughs
- *Emphasis on common teacher language across strategies and grade levels
- *Mad minutes, computer based programs, spiral review

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.

- *Creating meaningful parent involvement through out PTA, SAC, Papa Bears program, curriculum and family nights, and continuous teacher/parent communication.
- *Celebrating personal achievement and good behavior with our Citizen of the Month assemblies, report card award assemblies, Bear Bucks program which highlights positive student behavior.
- *Establishing school and classroom norms at the beginning of the year which builds our values and expectations that help to make a successful year.
- *Teachers, administrators, and faculty all model the behaviors in which we want the kids to exhibit.
- *Character Guidance program in which we focus on model character traits that are important in becoming and developing in a productive and caring citizen.
- *Encouraging innovation in our classrooms through the use of one to one technology helps to heighten the level of interest, concentration, and overall enjoyment as the students master academic content in innovative ways.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00