Schwarzkopf Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Schwarzkopf Elementary School

18333 CALUSA TRACE BLVD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pamela Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (78%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%)
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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
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
Holley, Cheryl	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.
Caro, Lori	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.
Barnes, StephanieE	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair
Shrewsbury, Susanne	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/29/2022, Pamela Wilkins

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.*
5

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

4

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

2

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	78	103	94	97	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	9	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	1	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	102	87	94	98	92	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	9	5	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	102	87	94	98	92	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	9	5	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	53%	56%				77%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	77%						63%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						51%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	86%	50%	50%				83%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	86%						89%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%						75%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	59%	59%				70%	50%	53%

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	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

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	79%	54%	25%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	60%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

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	36	61	43	48	72	79	38				
ELL	55	72	67	85	93	91	53				
ASN	84	88		94	93						
BLK	80	73		87	64						
HSP	73	80	70	82	87	90	70				
MUL	79	80		83							
WHT	80	73	57	87	86	79	87				
FRL	66	77	58	77	83	78	71				
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	30	50	55	40	56	62	46				
ELL	55	69		68	77		64				
ASN	90			95							
BLK	76			81							
HSP	67	67	60	67	67	61	57				
MUL	88	70		92	80		77				
WHT	79	69	45	80	76	60	85				
FRL	62	67	60	67	72	65	57				
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				

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	76
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	608

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	72
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	90
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	76
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	76
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	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	78
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	71
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?

Bottom quartile in ELA only gained 3 points.

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

ESE learning gains.

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

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.

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

Math learning gains.

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

We implemented small group instruction in all classrooms, focused on foundational skills.

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

We will need to reach each student where they are by helping to build their background knowledge before concepts are taught to assist in helping them to keep up with their peers and with the content being taught. This will require in-depth content knowledge and knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards by teachers.

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.

District wide training.
BEST standards PD.
Utilizing internalization process steps during ELA content planning.

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

In depth data discussion with our new FSA scores from last year by our Instructional Leadership team will be held first in Sept and then multiple times a year to be able to bridge the gaps across content levels but also vertically by grade level.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Align standards based lessons with appropriately rigorous tasks, common instructional language, and assessments.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	There will be a significant increase in assessments both in district and state wide improvements in math and reading.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Regular classroom walkthroughs and observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Informal walkthroughs by leadership team and observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Frequent 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
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.

1. Grade-level collaboration meetings weekly to plan for rigorous tasks and include common academic language.
2. Walkthroughs with feedback and fidelity.

Person Responsible   Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Guided reading and small group ELA instruction Guided reading was not consistent in all classrooms Data shows a need for small group instruction in ELA
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	*walk-throughs *observation data *FAST data
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through district and state wide data assessments as well as walk-through and observational data discussions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	*Walk-throughs *Observations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Frequent walk-throughs and observations will hold teachers accountable for implementing and holding small group with fidelity in all content areas.

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.

Walk-throughs with feedback and fidelity checks.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ILT discussions showed the need for vocabulary and phonemic awareness across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	FAST data will increase in area of foundational skills.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through continual progress monitoring data on new FAST assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	*RTI groups *Computer based programs *spiral review
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Through continual conversations with teachers in professional learning communities and in our ILT's work samples and iReady data, there is a need for foundational skills to be continually embedded at all grade levels in all content areas.

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.

Instructional guide fidelity

Person Responsible   Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@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.

*Creating meaningful parent involvement throughout our PTA, SAC, 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, and 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 our students to exhibit.

*Character Guidance program in which we focus on model character traits that are important in becoming and developing a productive and caring citizen.

*Encouraging innovation in our classrooms through the use of technology, helps to heighten the level of interest, concentration, and overall enjoyment as the students master academic content in innovative ways.

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

All school staff has a role in promoting school culture. Every single staff member can in some way create positivity in our school. Our administration, instructional and non-instructional staff will all play a role by working together to accomplish the ideas listed above. We will work closely with our PTA and our SAC committee to ensure that we are involving our parents and community, as it takes the entire village to promote and maintain a positive environment both on and off campus.