
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

F. W. Buchholz High School

5510 NW 27TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/buchholz>

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Purvis

Start Date for this Principal: 10/2/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 Alachua 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

F. W. Buchholz High School

5510 NW 27TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/buchholz>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Buchholz High School accepts the responsibility to help all students set and attain personal, academic, and career goals while striving for excellence in all areas. The students, staff, parents, and business community are committed to working in partnership to create a community that expects adherence to high academic, social, and moral standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Buchholz High School is to provide a positive, safe, and culturally respectful atmosphere while helping students create personal, academic, and career goals. Our focus is to maximize the potential for all students and to teach them to become responsible and productive global citizens. We believe that all students can learn from a relevant curriculum and experiences beyond the classroom. Students will have opportunities within our school community to participate in well-rounded curricular and extracurricular programs to support their development.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ten Bieg, James	Principal	
Chance, Diana	Assistant Principal	APC
Johnson, Bruce	Assistant Principal	APA
Flamand, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Reading Chair
Bramlett, Lynne	Teacher, K-12	LA Chair
Smith, Julie	Assistant Principal	APSS
Pankey, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	Math chair
Kearney, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Science chair
Vinson, Christin	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chair
Foster, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	Fine Arts/Electives Chair
Lewis, Ted	Teacher, K-12	Performing Arts Chair

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669	570	567	502	2308
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	34	47	41	177
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	36	26	21	126
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	40	61	58	210
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	143	122	76	473

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	73	54	62	44	233

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	2	11

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

103

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	46	52	53	228
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	29	21	20	111
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	68	66	77	267
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	124	73	70	381

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	92	71	61	63	287

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	71%	59%	56%	70%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	51%	56%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	39%	42%	42%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	62%	54%	51%	54%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	54%	48%	43%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	45%	39%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	68%	68%	79%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	75%	73%	83%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	669 (0)	570 (0)	567 (0)	502 (0)	2308 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	55 ()	34 ()	47 ()	41 ()	177 (0)
One or more suspensions	43 (0)	36 (0)	26 (0)	21 (0)	126 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	51 (0)	40 (0)	61 (0)	58 (0)	210 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	132 (0)	143 (0)	122 (0)	76 (0)	473 (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.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	74%	60%	14%	55%	19%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	53%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	67%	55%	12%	53%	14%
	2018	73%	60%	13%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	66%	17%	67%	16%
2018	80%	68%	12%	65%	15%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	71%	10%	70%	11%
2018	83%	71%	12%	68%	15%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	56%	-29%	61%	-34%
2018	37%	60%	-23%	62%	-25%
Compare		-10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	48%	6%	57%	-3%
2018	71%	63%	8%	56%	15%
Compare		-17%			

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	24	41	36	32	31	30	50	45		100	30
ELL	58	70		70			80				
ASN	86	73		85	55		96	97		98	90
BLK	39	45	40	30	45	37	58	51		93	41

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
HSP	66	58	44	54	41	44	81	68		91	70
MUL	72	61	50	65	42		93	85		100	68
WHT	81	62	57	73	51	45	90	93		96	82
FRL	47	50	41	40	38	29	66	56		90	50
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	22	40	38	24	26	26	45	39		73	39
ELL	55	58		80	57						
ASN	84	73		82	67		91	90		100	82
BLK	38	50	43	27	35	30	46	62		85	40
HSP	70	53	42	60	40	33	74	74		96	61
MUL	72	58	30	49	60	38	83	77		89	69
WHT	83	68	60	77	64	59	92	91		93	79
FRL	48	52	43	40	40	32	57	66		86	51
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	19	31	27	29	30	27	39	55		66	41
ELL		60		40	50						
ASN	85	68		69	58		94	84		97	81
BLK	38	40	32	25	26	25	53	66		75	45
HSP	58	52	47	52	44	34	81	80		90	48
MUL	65	47	33	52	40	31	60	89		72	62
WHT	83	63	56	64	48	52	90	89		93	68
FRL	49	42	34	32	31	25	61	69		76	40

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	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	667
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	73
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	51
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.

Mathematics, especially in the lowest quartile. We unfortunately had to non-renew one of our math teachers for poor performance. We have also beefed up attempts to keep students in class (more hallway supervision, alternatives to suspension, incentives, etc.).

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

Mathematics, especially in the lowest quartile. We unfortunately had to non-renew one of our math teachers for poor performance. We have also beefed up attempts to keep students in class (more hallway supervision, alternatives to suspension, incentives, etc.).

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.

We were one percentage point below the state average in the lowest quartile in mathematics. We unfortunately had to non-renew one of our math teachers for poor performance. We have also beefed up attempts to keep students in class (more hallway supervision, alternatives to suspension, incentives, etc.).

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

Science achievement improved 4 percentage points. The science department has planned together more closely than previous years. Although no direct correlation can be measured, the school advisory council purchased a classroom set of digital microscopes for the department.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Math with special emphasis on the lowest quartile. We will also focus on suspension rates with emphasis on African American students.

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

1. Math (lowest quartile with special emphasis on Algebra)
2. Math
3. ELA (lowest quartile)
4. ELA
5. Suspension rates

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increase gains of lowest quartile in ELA
Rationale Both a school and district-wide area of focus in an attempt to close the achievement gap.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase by 3 percentage points annually, or 1 percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years, whichever is greater. Buchholz seeks to increase learning gains to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Diana Chance (chancedb@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy Data analysis derived AIMS, previous year's student performance, and informal classroom assessments. Department/subject area modifications/strategies derived from data analysis may include (but are not limited to) sharing of instructional methods, varied student groupings, alternate teaching strategies, multi-modal teaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy AIMS is the best indicator SBAC has for predicting performance on end-of-year standardized tests.

Action Step

Description 1. Analysis of AIMS data
 2. Data chats
 3. Analysis of classroom grades
 4.
 5.

Person Responsible Diana Chance (chancedb@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Increase gains of lowest quartile in mathematics
Rationale	Both a school and district-wide area of focus in an attempt to close the achievement gap.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase by 3 percentage points annually, or 1 percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years, whichever is greater. Buchholz seeks to increase learning gains to 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Diana Chance (chancedb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data analysis derived AIMS, previous year's student performance, and informal classroom assessments. Department/subject area modifications/strategies derived from data analysis may include (but are not limited to) sharing of instructional methods, varied student groupings, alternate teaching strategies, multi-modal teaching
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AIMS is the best indicator SBAC has for predicting performance on end-of-year standardized tests.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of AIMS data 2. Data chats 3. Analysis of classroom grades 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Decrease out of school suspension days
Rationale	Suspensions excludes students from classroom instruction. Time on task correlates with learning gains.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Buchholz seeks to decrease out of school suspension days for all students by 3% (1103 down from 1138). Buchholz will reduce the number of out of school suspensions for African American students by 10%, from 2017 to 186.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bruce Johnson (johnsob@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring through discipline reports
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Suspensions excludes students from classroom instruction. Time on task correlates with learning gains. 1,138 days of suspension are equivalent to over a quarter of a million potential minutes of lost instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of BASE online program 2. Increased counseling 3. Limiting/lowering severity of infractions as consequences. 4. Increased supervision 5. Revamped discipline plan with positive behavior support
Person Responsible	Bruce Johnson (johnsob@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Our big focus beyond what has been mentioned is school safety. We have revamped supervision as well as our critical incident procedures resulting from the input from previous drills. We have revamped duty stations, evacuation procedures, created kits in case of we must check out students at evacuation points, and revamped procedures for housing students at evacuation points.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase gains of lowest quartile in ELA				\$138,483.16
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0431 - F. W. Buchholz High School	School Improvement Funds		\$138,483.16
			<i>Notes: A total of \$276,966.32 were spent on SAC funds. Although these instructional salaries went to several subject areas, the money benefit ELA if for no other reason then to reduce the class size loads in ELA. For the purposes of this report, We have put half in the ELA budget line and half in the math budget line (\$138,483.16 for each).</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase gains of lowest quartile in mathematics				\$138,483.16
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0431 - F. W. Buchholz High School	School Improvement Funds		\$138,483.16
			<i>Notes: A total of \$276,966.32 were spent on SAC funds. Although these instructional salaries went to several subject areas, the money benefit math if for no other reason then to reduce the class size loads in math. For the purposes of this report, We have put half in the ELA budget line and half in the math budget line (\$138,483.16 for each). As of this writing, we can't get the</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Decrease out of school suspension days				\$0.00
					Total:	\$276,966.32